MARYLAND SPECIAL EDUCATION/EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES

STATE IMPROVEMENT GRANT PERFORMANCE REPORT SY 2000-2001

MARCH 2002

STATE AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS REPORT



Maryland State Board of Education

Marilyn D. Maultsby

President

Reginald L. Dunn

Vice President

Jo Ann T. Bell

Philip S. Benzil

Dunbar Brooks

Rev. Clarence A. Hawkins

Walter S. Levin

Karabelle Pizzigati

Edward L. Root

Walter Sondheim, Jr.

John L. Wisthoff

Lauren McAlee (student member)

Nancy S. Grasmick

Secretary-Treasurer of the Board

State Superintendent of Schools

Richard J. Steinke

Deputy State Superintendent, Instruction and Academic Acceleration

Carol Ann Baglin

Assistant State Superintendent, Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Lucy Hession

Principal Investigator, Maryland State Improvement Grant

This is the 12th year for educational reform in Maryland and we have been including students with disabilities as a part of the program since its initiation. This is the end of the third year of the Maryland State Improvement Grant (MSIG). This grant was competitively awarded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, to the Maryland State Department of Education with performance goals and indicators aligned to demonstrate broad-based educational reform to ensure that all students participate in innovative and challenging educational programs and are included in accountability procedures.

This annual report documents the progress students with disabilities and schools are making toward meeting Maryland's rigorous standards. It includes areas matched to our performance goals and indicators and specifies areas in which we must improve. In this report those school systems have been identified that have met or maintained the MSIG indicator signifying major improvement for their programs for students with disabilities.

The MSIG is a five year grant which, when fully implemented, will demonstrate the strides Maryland has made in the inclusion of students with disabilities in the state reform movement. Students with disabilities participate in all statewide and local assessments. Based upon grant requirements, several areas are identified for tracking and monitoring. Our reform program is guided by these three fundamental principles:

- *All children can learn
- *All children have the right to attend schools in which they can progress and learn
- *All children shall have a real opportunity to learn equally rigorous content

Our teachers, therapists, paraprofessionals, and administrators are commended for the progress that is being made. These improvements are the result of local early intervention systems, school teams' efforts, and the support from administrators, teachers, children and youth, service providers, parents, businesses and the community.

Thank you for reviewing this report and demonstrating your interest in special education and early intervention in Maryland.

Carol Ann Baglin March 2002

MARYLAND SPECIAL EDUCATION / EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES ANNUAL STATE IMPROVEMENT PERFORMANCE REPORT

This report presents information and the standards of performance that provide the basis for school improvement for the Maryland State Improvement Grant (MSIG). Included are baseline results and comparisons to previous years. These include:

Early Childhood Assessment Program	4
Maryland Functional Tests	7
Maryland School Performance Assessment Program	12
Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills	18
Participation in General Education Classrooms	21
Preschool LRE	22
Students Receiving Diplomas or Certificates	24
Independence Mastery Assessment Program (IMAP)	28
Students Exempted From MSPAP	29
Suspensions	31
Functional Behavioral Assessments and Intervention Plans	34
Participation in Non-General Education Classrooms	35
Attendance Rates	37
Drop-Out Rates	38
Special Education by Race	40
Professional Development	46
Teacher / Therapist Certification	53
Early Intervention Services	57
Appendix A "Elaboration of LSS Exemptions from MSPAP"	
Appendix B "LSS Profiles"	
Appendix C "School District CSPD Submissions"	
Appendix D "SIG Funding Sources by Goals, IHE, and LSS"	

DEFINITIONS

Attendance Rate: The percentage of students present in school for at least half the school day during the school year.

Dropout Rate: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who withdrew from school before graduation or before completing a Maryland approved educational program during the July-to-June academic year.

Exempt: Students who are not pursuing a Maryland High School Diploma are not required to pass the Maryland Functional Tests. The only students who can be exempted from MSPAP are those who are not pursuing the Maryland Learning Outcomes. Exemptions must be based on the student's LEP (See MSDE Accommodations document for complete explanation). Students exempted from MSPAP must participate in LMAP (alternate assessment).

General Education Classroom: Includes students with disabilities enrolled in a comprehensive school who receive special education and related services *outside the general education classroom* for less than 21% (12/1 Child Count) of the school day. **Preschool:** Any combination of regular early childhood settings with no pullout, e.g., EEEP, Headstart, or other early childhood settings.

Non-General Education Classroom: Includes students who receive greater than 50% (12/1 Child Count) of instruction at home, hospital setting, public separate day school, private separate day school, public or private residential facility.

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP): Annual tests that require students in grades 3, 5, and 8 to apply what they know about reading, writing, language usage, mathematics, science and social studies. Unlike the Functional Tests, which measure basic knowledge, the MSPAP tests set high expectations and demand high levels of performance.

Standards:

Maryland Functional Tests	Grade Tested	Satisfactory	Excellent
Reading	Grade 9	95%	97%
Reading	Grade 11	97%	99%
Mathematics	Grade 9	80%	90%
iviatriematics	Grade 11	97%	99%
Writing	Grade 9	90%	96%
vviiting	Grade 11	97%	99%
Citizenship	Grade 11	97%	99%
Passed All Tests	Grade 11	90%	96%
MSPAP Grades 3, 5, and 8			
All test	s*	70%*	25%
Attendance (Yearly)		94%	96%
Drop-out (Grades 9-12)		3.00% 1.25%	

[•] A school meets the *excellent standard* on the MSPAP only when **70% or more** of its students achieve at the satisfactory level or above and 25% or more of its students achieve at the excellent level.

Verification of Data:

School system data contained in this report was submitted to the Maryland State Department of Education by local school systems. Local superintendents agreed with data reconciliation reached by local school system and State Department of Education personnel. Data was gathered from the Special Education Census Data report, Analysis of Professional Salaries report, Maryland School Performance Report and US Office of Education Report to Congress.

Data Sources:

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory scores: from School System Disaggregated Data 2000-2001, Maryland School Performance Report 2001

Maryland Functional Tests (MFT) – Satisfactory scores: from School System Disaggregated Data 2000-2001, Maryland School Performance Report 2001

Percent Regular, Percent Resource, Percent Separate: calculated from data on Page 8, Table 7, Maryland Special Education Census Data, December 1, 2000 (Revised 8/7/01), published by The Maryland State Department of Education

Attendance and Drop Out: from School System Disaggregated Data 2000-2001, Maryland School Performance Report 2001

Per Pupil Cost: from School System Disaggregated Data 2000-2001, Other Factors, Maryland School Performance Report 2001

Professional Instructional Staff (average salaries): from data on Page 8, Table 1, Analysis of Professional Salaries, Maryland Public Schools, October 2000, published by The Maryland State Department of Education

Special School and Other: calculated from data on Page 10, Table 7, Maryland Special Education Census Data, December 1, 2000 (Revised 8/7/01), published by The Maryland State Department of Education

MSIG Goal: By the year 2005, students with disabilities will perform at the satisfactory level on statewide assessments.

MSIG Goal 1

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

Objective 1-1

To analyze and report data on the results of students with disabilities on statewide and district performance tests; on their participation in general education; and on their high school completion with diplomas and certificates.

Indicators 1-1

- **1.1.1** The percent of kindergarten-age children with disabilities participating in the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment Program will increase annually.
- **1.1.2** The results of the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment performance indicators will be used for measuring and improving school readiness of students entering kindergarten with an LEP.
- **1.1.3** The percent of students with disabilities passing the Maryland Functional Tests will increase by 1.5% annually.
- **1.1.4** The percent of students with disabilities scoring at satisfactory on the MSPAP will increase by 3.0% annually.
- **1.1.5** Average scores of students with disabilities on norm-referenced tests will increase by 0.5% annually over the base.
- **1.1.6** The percentage of time that students with disabilities participate in general education classrooms will increase by 2% annually.
- **1.1.7** The percentage of students with disabilities who receive high school diplomas will increase by 2%.

Objective 1-2

To organize, analyze, and report data on post-high school employment and participation in post-secondary education among students with disabilities.

Indicators 1-2

- **1.2.1** Post-high school employment of students with disabilities will increase by 2% annually.
- **1.2.2** Participation of students with disabilities in post-secondary education will increase annually.

Objective 1-3

To organize, analyze, and report data on the performance of eligible students on alternative assessments.

Indicators 1-3

- **1.3.1** The percent satisfactory on IMAP will increase by 3% annually.
- **1.3.2** By 2001, no student in Maryland will be exempted or excluded from statewide performance assessment.

Objective 1-4

Within local school systems, the significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions for students with disabilities as compared to the general student population will decrease.

Indicators 1-4

- **1.4.1** Within local school systems, the percentage of students with disabilities receiving long-term suspensions will decrease annually to reduce the significant discrepancy.
- **1.4.2** Within local school systems, the percentage of students with disabilities receiving short-term suspensions will decrease annually to reduce the significant discrepancy.
- **1.4.3** Functional behavioral assessments (as defined) will decrease by 10% annually.
- **1.4.4** Placements of students in non-general education classrooms will decrease by 10% annually.

Objective 1-5

To organize, analyze, and report data on attendance and dropout rates of students with disabilities.

Indicators 1-5

- **1.5.1** Average attendance rates of students with disabilities will improve by .2% annually.
- **1.5.2** Dropout rates of students with disabilities will decrease by 0.5% annually.

Objective 1-6

Within local school systems, the percentage of African American students with disabilities and African American students in the total student population will be proportionate.

Indicators 1-6

- **1.6.1** Within local school systems, the disproportionate identification of African American students as students with a disability will decrease annually.
- **1.6.2** Within local school systems, the disproportionate identification of African American students as mentally retarded (MR), emotionally disturbed (ED), learning disabled (LD), and "other disabilities" (as an aggregated category) will decrease.

Objective 1-7

To use data on performance results and other outcomes of students with disabilities to establish and monitor long-term State, regional, and local priorities for professional development; preservice development, recruitment and retention; and technical assistance leading to instructional development.

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

Objective 1-1

To analyze and report data on the results of students with disabilities on statewide and district performance tests; on their participation in general education; and on their high school completion with diplomas and certificates.

Baseline Results for Goal Indicators 1.1.1 and 1.1.2

- 1.1.1 The percent of kindergarten-age children with disabilities participating in the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment Program will increase annually.
- **1.1.2** The results of the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment performance indicators will be used for measuring and improving school readiness of students entering kindergarten with an LEP.

School Readiness Baseline Information School Year 2001-2002 Percent of Students at the School Readiness Levels (1.1.2)

	Full Readiness	Approaching Readiness	Developing Readiness
Special Education Students	30.8%	50.4%	18.8%
Regular Education Students	50.4%	43.1%	6.5%

Kindergarten Work Sampling System Participation (1.1.1)

	Special Education students for whom	Special Education
Local School System	assessment ratings were completed	Kindergarten Enrollment
	Fall 2001	as of Dec. 1, 2001
Allegany	102	102
Anne Arundel	210	329
Baltimore City	355	573
Edison Schools	*	6
Baltimore County	451	724
Calvert	74	96
Caroline	28	47
Carroll	101	197
Cecil	76	135
Charles	79	92
Dorchester	0	22
Frederick	144	176
Garrett	16	34
Harford	36	268
Howard	188	252
Kent	134	7
Montgomery	216	699
Prince George's	351	531
Queen Anne's	35	42
Saint Mary's	76	111
Somerset	10	10
Talbot	17	21
Washington	101	118
Wicomico	20	53
Worcester	*	35
STATE	2825	4680

^{*} Fewer than 5 students

Trend Results for Goal Indicator 1.1.3

1.1.3 The percent of students with disabilities passing the Maryland Functional Tests will increase by 1.5% annually. (For example, if 80% of students with disabilities passed during the 1997-98 baseline year then 1.5% more would have to pass the next year, for a total of 81.5%, to meet the MSIG annual goal.)

Computation Methodology

I dentify the percent of students with disabilities who pass the *Maryland Functional Tests* at the 9th and 11th grade level. Compare current results with the previous year and determine if there was a 1.5 percentage point gain (e.g. If Cecil Co. had an 87% pass rate in the previous year, they would need 88.5% the next year). State *Satisfactory* and *Excellent* percentages are:

Maryland Functional Tests	Grade	Satisfactory	Excellent	
Reading	Grade 9	95%	97%	
Reading	Grade 11	97%	99%	
Mathematics	Grade 9	80%	90%	
Iviatriematics	Grade 11	97%	99%	
Writing	Grade 9	90%	96%	
vviiting	Grade 11	97%	99%	

Shading identifies systems meeting the *Maryland State Improvement Grant* (MSIG) targeted increase of 1.5 percentage points.

SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS GRADE 9 PERCENT PASSING MARYLAND FUNCTIONAL TESTS 2000-2001 (1.1.3)

		ding		ath	ĺ	Writing	
	(Satisfactory-95%)			(Satisfactory-80%)		(Satisfactory-90%)	
SCHOOL YEAR	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	98.6	98.7	87.0	84.5	94.5	93.8	
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	86.7	86.5	71.7	67.5	74.3	68.7	
Local School System							
Allegany	93.9	88.9	.88.0	∙80.9	74.5	68.5	
Anne Arundel	88.7	89.5	78.5	75.6	85.6	73.5	
Baltimore City	61.3	62.7	31.0	30.3	33.3	31.2	
Baltimore Co.	93.6	92.3	· 91.4	.83.2	84.4	81.6	
Calvert	. 95.9	.96.5	.95.2	· 91.4	.93.0	.96.4	
Caroline	85.4	78.3	.82.9	71.7	75.0	68.9	
Carroll	94.8	94.9	.87.8	.84.2	. 95.5	.95.2	
Cecil	· 100.0	·100.0	75.5	60.0	.91.9	88.1	
Charles	89.0	88.8	.82.7	77.6	81.5	79.7	
Dorchester	78.9	69.8	23.7	27.9	59.0	48.8	
Frederick	94.6	90.7	⋅85.2	77.7	86.6	76.2	
Garrett	91.8	.95.3	77.6	79.5	89.8	73.8	
Harford	89.8	89.9	76.1	76.9	77.8	78.4	
Howard	92.5	.96.6	78.4	∙84.1	81.3	81.9	
Kent	92.6	50.0	74.1	33.3	84.6	33.3	
Montgomery	93.4	93.7	.80.6	∙80.6	83.5	73.7	
Prince George's	86.6	85.6	55.2	48.1	61.3	61.7	
Queen Anne's	94.5	91.4	72.6	75.4	73.9	70.8	
Saint Mary's	88.3	87.4	61.3	48.6	68.8	72.2	
Somerset	76.5	84.6	61.8	69.2	78.8	73.1	
Talbot	85.7	85.7	∙85.7	69.0	72.7	65.9	
Washington	92.7	.95.6	∙85.0	∙87.7	80.2	79.6	
Wicomico	93.5	86.7	69.4	67.0	78.1	56.3	
Worcester	93.5	90.9	.80.6	.96.4	88.7	81.8	

Met MSIG Indicator of a 1.5 percentage point gain over the previous year.

· Met General Education standard.

SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS GRADE 11 PERCENT PASSING MARYLAND FUNCTIONAL TESTS 2000-2001 (1.1.3)

	Reading		Ma	ith	Writing		
	(Satisfact	•	(Satisfact	(Satisfactory-97%)		(Satisfactory-97%)	
SCHOOL YEAR	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	99.7	99.7	96.3	95.2	98.8	98.7	
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	96.8	96.1	92.5	89.8	92.3	90.2	
Local School System							
Allegany	. 98.7	.98.9	91.1	91.2	87.2	94.4	
Anne Arundel	96.7	96.3	94.5	94.8	94.7	93.0	
Baltimore City	88.2	83.8	66.1	57.7	67.7	60.0	
Baltimore Co.	.99.0	.99.2	. 98.3	.97.6	96.0	96.6	
Calvert	∙100.0	.98.5	. 98.4	. 98.5	. 98.4	⋅100.0	
Caroline	· 100.0	· 100.0	⋅100.0	77.8	· 100.0	·100.0	
Carroll	96.9	.99.5	.97.3	.97.0	. 98.4	.99.0	
Cecil	⋅100.0	.100.0	94.3	95.7	· 100.0	∙98.6	
Charles	96.8	. 97.5	95.7	95.0	96.8	93.2	
Dorchester	87.5	93.3	93.8	90.0	93.8	86.7	
Frederick	95.4	.98.3	94.0	96.6	90.7	91.1	
Garrett	96.2	.97.3	92.3	· 100.0	96.0	94.4	
Harford	.98.8	. 98.1	. 98.0	. 98.1	96.5	96.5	
Howard	. 98.1	. 97.7	93.8	.97.2	93.2	94.9	
Kent	· 100.0	85.7	⋅100.0	78.6	· 100.0	85.7	
Montgomery	. 98.5	. 99.1	95.9	95.7	.97.0	96.3	
Prince George's	.97.3	94.4	90.1	81.5	93.1	88.2	
Queen Anne's	.98.2	93.5	.98.2	91.3	92.7	91.3	
Saint Mary's	93.9	95.3	90.9	88.7	83.3	87.7	
Somerset	95.0	82.4	.100.0	82.4	.100.0	· 100.0	
Talbot	· 100.0	94.1	· 100.0	94.1	84.6	88.2	
Washington	.98.4	· 100.0	.99.2	.98.4	94.5	95.2	
Wicomico	· 100.0	·100.0	93.5	100.0	93.6	· 100.0	
Worcester	· 100.0	·100.0	92.3	96.4	94.9	90.9	

Met MSIG Indicator of a 1.5 percentage point gain over the previous year.

· Met General Education standard.

LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM GRADE 9 FUNCTIONAL TESTS RANKED BY PERCENT PASSING 2000-2001

Local School System	Reading	Local School System	Math	Local School System	Writing
Cecil	100.0	Worcester	96.4	Calvert	96.4
Howard	96.6	Calvert	91.4	Carroll	95.2
Calvert	96.5	Washington	87.7	Cecil	88.1
Washington	95.6	Carroll	84.2	Howard	81.9
Garrett	95.3	Howard	84.1	Worcester	81.8
Carroll	94.9	Baltimore Co.	83.2	Baltimore Co.	81.6
Montgomery	93.7	Allegany	80.9	Charles	79.7
Baltimore Co.	92.3	Montgomery	80.6	Washington	79.6
Queen Anne's	91.4	Garrett	79.5	Harford	78.4
Worcester	90.9	Frederick	77.7	Frederick	76.2
Frederick	90.7	Charles	77.6	Garrett	73.8
Harford	89.9	Harford	76.9	Montgomery	73.7
Anne Arundel	89.5	Anne Arundel	75.6	Anne Arundel	73.5
Allegany	88.9	Queen Anne's	75.4	Somerset	73.1
Charles	88.8	Caroline	71.7	Saint Mary's	72.2
Saint Mary's	87.4	Somerset	69.2	Queen Anne's	70.8
Wicomico	86.7	Talbot	69.0	Caroline	68.9
STATE	86.5	STATE	67.5	STATE	68.7
Talbot	85.7	Wicomico	67.0	Allegany	68.5
Prince George's	85.6	Cecil	60.0	Talbot	65.9
Somerset	84.6	Saint Mary's	48.6	Prince George's	61.7
Caroline	78.3	Prince George's	48.1	Wicomico	56.3
Dorchester	69.8	Kent	33.3	Dorchester	48.8
Baltimore City	62.7	Baltimore City	30.3	Kent	33.3
Kent	50.0	Dorchester	27.9	Baltimore City	31.2

LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM GRADE 11 FUNCTIONAL TESTS RANKED BY PERCENT PASSING 2000-2001

Local School System	Reading	Local School System	Math	Local School System	Writing
Caroline	100.0	Garrett	100.0	Garrett	100.0
Cecil	100.0	Wicomico	100.0	Wicomico	100.0
Washington	100.0	Calvert	98.5	Calvert	98.5
Wicomico	100.0	Washington	98.4	Washington	98.4
Worcester	100.0	Harford	98.1	Harford	98.1
Carroll	99.5	Baltimore Co.	97.6	Baltimore Co.	97.6
Baltimore Co.	99.2	Howard	97.2	Howard	97.2
Montgomery	99.1	Carroll	97.0	Carroll	97.0
Allegany	98.9	Frederick	96.6	Frederick	96.6
Calvert	98.5	Worcester	96.4	Worcester	96.4
Frederick	98.3	Cecil	95.7	Cecil	95.7
Harford	98.1	Montgomery	95.7	Montgomery	95.7
Howard	97.7	Charles	95.0	Charles	95.0
Charles	97.5	Anne Arundel	94.8	Anne Arundel	94.8
Garrett	97.3	Talbot	94.1	Talbot	94.1
Anne Arundel	96.3	Queen Anne's	91.3	Queen Anne's	91.3
STATE	96.1	Allegany	91.2	Allegany	91.2
Saint Mary's	95.3	Dorchester	90.0	STATE	90.2
Prince George's	94.4	STATE	89.8	Dorchester	90.0
Talbot	94.1	Saint Mary's	88.7	Saint Mary's	88.7
Queen Anne's	93.5	Somerset	82.4	Somerset	82.4
Dorchester	93.3	Prince George's	81.5	Prince George's	81.5
Kent	85.7	Kent	78.6	Kent	78.6
Baltimore City	83.8	Caroline	77.8	Caroline	77.8
Somerset	82.4	Baltimore City	57.7	Baltimore City	57.7

Results for Goal Indicator 1.1.4

1.1.4 The percent of students with disabilities scoring at satisfactory on the MSPAP will increase by 3.0% annually. (For example, if 40% of students with disabilities achieved satisfactorily during the previous year, then 3% more would have to achieve satisfactory the next year, for a total of 43%, to meet the MSIG annual goal.)

Computation Methodology

I dentify the percent of students with disabilities at the satisfactory performance level on the MSPAP Tests at each grade level, 3rd, 5th and 8th. Compare current results with the previous year and determine if there was a 3-percentage point gain. Satisfactory percentages are:

MSPAP Grades 3, 5, and 8	
Satisfactory All tests	70%

Shading identifies systems meeting the *Maryland State Improvement Grant* (MSIG) targeted increase of 3 percentage points.

SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS PERCENT AT SATISFACTORY 2000-2001 THIRD GRADE MSPAP (1.1.4)

	Reading	Writing	Language Use.	Math	Science	Social Sty.
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	37.5	50.0	48.5	39.6	37.3	38.5
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	25.6	36.0	26.9	26.2	27.4	26.4
Local School System						
Allegany	25.3	53.8	25.3	45.6	48.5	40.9
Anne Arundel	27.3	35.6	30.2	27.1	25.3	25.4
Baltimore City	9.6	13.8	11.1	12.0	12.8	13.3
Baltimore County	38.9	51.1	39.3	40.1	43.2	42.0
Calvert	29.7	35.6	29.4	20.6	21.3	16.3
Caroline	23.3	52.4	24.2	44.4	41.3	47.6
Carroll	29.1	41.0	21.0	29.5	34.5	32.4
Cecil	43.5	59.0	39.6	46.0	55.5	45.5
Charles	21.7	32.1	20.0	16.7	19.0	17.9
Dorchester	26.3	32.5	35.0	30.0	30.0	27.5
Frederick	25.9	34.8	25.6	22.6	25.0	23.6
Garrett	13.8	21.7	8.3	21.7	18.3	21.7
Harford	27.6	37.6	30.6	29.1	25.2	26.1
Howard	38.4	36.8	28.1	28.3	27.1	25.6
Kent	46.7	60.0	38.9	.76.7	· 73.3	·73.3
Montgomery	21.7	37.9	29.0	21.7	22.7	22.1
Prince George's	16.3	28.1	23.9	19.8	22.1	22.3
Queen Anne's	15.8	31.2	18.2	20.4	18.3	20.4
Saint Mary's	36.2	44.6	42.7	36.8	37.3	35.8
Somerset	7.1	22.9	25.0	5.7	11.4	8.6
Talbot	6.7	14.3	21.1	5.7	14.3	2.9
Washington	40.4	46.6	33.1	33.2	35.4	30.5
Wicomico	23.2	41.2	35.7	35.2	36.4	31.5
Worcester	19.0	38.5	22.6	16.9	16.9	18.5

Met MSIG Indicator of a 3-percentage point gain over the previous year.

Note: See Appendix A for exemption data

Met General Education standard; Satisfactory - 70%

SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS PERCENT AT SATISFACTORY 2000-2001 FIFTH GRADE MSPAP (1.1.4)

	Reading	Writing	Language Use.	Math	Science	Social Sty.
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	46.6	45.9	55.8	46.7	52.8	46.9
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	25.4	24.9	24.5	20.7	30.7	25.7
Local School System						
Allegany	23.9	38.8	24.1	32.9	49.4	38.2
Anne Arundel	30.1	23.2	27.7	20.6	30.9	25.5
Baltimore City	5.6	7.4	6.0	6.9	11.5	8.1
Baltimore Co.	36.7	35.0	37.0	31.1	44.4	39.8
Calvert	32.3	27.8	33.1	23.5	32.6	27.8
Caroline	25.0	35.9	17.6	43.8	45.3	43.8
Carroll	21.8	30.3	22.7	21.6	34.1	28.3
Cecil	39.2	42.9	35.3	30.0	52.5	41.5
Charles	30.0	19.6	17.8	16.0	22.4	19.6
Dorchester	35.4	26.1	40.9	29.5	45.5	35.2
Frederick	23.6	24.5	25.8	20.2	30.0	25.5
Garrett	21.4	21.3	14.1	22.5	33.7	25.8
Harford	34.4	31.0	37.6	26.4	39.2	32.5
Howard	36.9	25.9	26.4	27.4	32.8	24.7
Kent	35.3	16.2	18.2	18.9	27.0	24.3
Montgomery	26.9	29.2	31.6	22.5	32.6	27.3
Prince George's	14.2	16.2	15.6	11.0	19.9	17.3
Queen Anne's	22.4	32.1	31.7	16.0	33.0	32.1
Saint Mary's	32.5	34.4	42.3	29.7	42.5	34.0
Somerset	14.3	7.4	0.0	14.8	18.5	25.9
Talbot	33.3	9.5	6.3	14.3	26.2	21.4
Washington	33.1	33.9	28.3	28.9	40.1	32.6
Wicomico	24.5	29.4	26.0	22.1	30.7	26.4
Worcester	18.0	27.9	25.9	19.1	19.1	14.7

Met MSIG Indicator of a 3-percentage point gain over the previous year.

Note: See Appendix A for exemption data

Met General Education standard; Satisfactory - 70%

SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS PERCENT AT SATISFACTORY 2000-2001 EIGHTH GRADE MSPAP (1.1.4)

	Reading	Writing	Language Use.	Math	Science	Social Sty
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	28.9	55.0	50.4	52.0	57.5	51.4
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	7.2	19.4	13.0	16.0	19.2	15.8
Local School System						
Allegany	4.8	9.3	6.6	6.2	11.3	9.3
Anne Arundel	6.1	18.8	13.2	15.9	18.7	16.0
Baltimore City	1.0	5.7	2.1	1.9	2.3	2.6
Baltimore Co.	7.6	24.5	16.4	19.0	24.5	22.5
Calvert	12.2	26.2	18.9	21.5	33.0	28.3
Caroline	4.8	18.4	11.1	4.1	12.2	6.1
Carroll	6.8	21.3	14.7	24.1	30.0	22.8
Cecil	1.9	15.7	10.3	11.1	17.2	10.6
Charles	10.0	17.0	9.4	12.8	18.3	13.8
Dorchester	5.6	11.9	6.5	2.4	9.5	11.9
Frederick	9.3	27.9	21.6	27.1	30.8	22.2
Garrett	3.0	25.8	6.1	27.4	17.7	25.8
Harford	13.3	32.7	22.3	23.3	33.4	25.6
Howard	14.2	26.4	22.1	29.3	33.1	27.4
Kent	9.1	18.2	4.8	9.1	36.4	13.6
Montgomery	11.0	25.4	24.3	24.8	25.3	20.2
Prince George's	3.6	11.9	6.2	5.7	7.5	6.4
Queen Anne's	7.8	23.3	12.2	12.2	22.2	12.2
Saint Mary's	7.0	17.7	13.6	18.4	14.3	15.6
Somerset	12.5	55.6	22.2	33.3	27.8	38.9
Talbot	0.0	13.0	5.6	8.7	10.9	13.0
Washington	9.6	19.0	11.8	18.2	15.7	13.6
Wicomico	4.9	19.8	9.9	9.9	23.1	17.6
Worcester	11.1	17.7	6.4	19.4	27.4	22.6

Met MSIG Indicator of a 3-percentage point gain over the previous year.

Note: See Appendix A for exemption data

Met General Education standard; Satisfactory - 70%

THIRD GRADE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES RANKED BY PERCENT AT SATISFACTORY MSPAP 2000-2001 RESULTS BY LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM

Local School System	Reading	Local School System	Writing	Local School System	Lang. Use.	Local School System	Math	Local School System	Science	Local School System	Social Studies
Kent	46.7	Kent	60.0	Saint Mary's	42.7	Kent	76.7	Kent	73.3	Kent	73.3
Cecil	43.5	Cecil	59.0	Cecil	39.6	Cecil	46.0	Cecil	55.5	Caroline	47.6
Washington	40.4	Allegany	53.8	Baltimore Co	39.3	Allegany	45.6	Allegany	48.5	Cecil	45.5
Baltimore Co	38.9	Caroline	52.4	Kent	38.9	Caroline	44.4	Baltimore Co	43.2	Baltimore Co	42.0
Howard	38.4	Baltimore Co	51.1	Wicomico	35.7	Baltimore Co	40.1	Caroline	41.3	Allegany	40.9
Saint Mary's	36.2	Washington	46.6	Dorchester	35.0	Saint Mary's	36.8	Saint Mary's	37.3	Saint Mary's	35.8
Calvert	29.7	Saint Mary's	44.6	Washington	33.1	Wicomico	35.2	Wicomico	36.4	Carroll	32.4
Carroll	29.1	Wicomico	41.2	Harford	30.6	Washington	33.2	Washington	35.4	Wicomico	31.5
Harford	27.6	Carroll	41.0	Anne Arundel	30.2	Dorchester	30.0	Carroll	34.5	Washington	30.5
Anne Arundel	27.3	Worcester	38.5	Calvert	29.4	Carroll	29.5	Dorchester	30.0	Dorchester	27.5
Dorchester	26.3	Montgomery	37.9	Montgomery	29.0	Harford	29.1	STATE	27.4	STATE	26.4
Frederick	25.9	Harford	37.6	Howard	28.1	Howard	28.3	Howard	27.1	Harford	26.1
STATE	25.6	Howard	36.8	STATE	26.9	Anne Arundel	27.1	Anne Arundel	25.3	Howard	25.6
Allegany	25.3	STATE	36.0	Frederick	25.6	STATE	26.2	Harford	25.2	Anne Arundel	25.4
Caroline	23.3	Anne Arundel	35.6	Allegany	25.3	Frederick	22.6	Frederick	25.0	Frederick	23.6
Wicomico	23.2	Calvert	35.6	Somerset	25.0	Garrett	21.7	Montgomery	22.7	Prince George's	22.3
Charles	21.7	Frederick	34.8	Caroline	24.2	Montgomery	21.7	Prince George's	22.1	Montgomery	22.1
Montgomery	21.7	Dorchester	32.5	Prince George's	23.9	Calvert	20.6	Calvert	21.3	Garrett	21.7
Worcester	19.0	Charles	32.1	Worcester	22.6	Queen Anne's	20.4	Charles	19.0	Queen Anne's	20.4
Prince George's	16.3	Queen Anne's	31.2	Talbot	21.1	Prince George's	19.8	Garrett	18.3	Worcester	18.5
Queen Anne's	15.8	Prince George's	28.1	Carroll	21.0	Worcester	16.9	Queen Anne's	18.3	Charles	17.9
Garrett	13.8	Somerset	22.9	Charles	20.0	Charles	16.7	Worcester	16.9	Calvert	16.3
Baltimore City	9.6	Garrett	21.7	Queen Anne's	18.2	Baltimore City	12.0	Talbot	14.3	Baltimore City	13.3
Somerset	7.1	Talbot	14.3	Baltimore City	11.1	Somerset	5.7	Baltimore City	12.8	Somerset	8.6
Talbot	6.7	Baltimore City	13.8	Garrett	8.3	Talbot	5.7	Somerset	11.4	Talbot	2.9

FIFTH GRADE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES RANKED BY PERCENT AT SATISFACTORY MSPAP 2000-2001 RESULTS BY LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM

Local School System	Reading	Local School System	Writing	Local School System	Lang. Use.	Local School System	Math	Local School System	Science	Local School System	Social Studies
Cecil	39.2	Cecil	42.9	Saint Mary's	42.3	Caroline	43.8	Cecil	52.5	Caroline	43.8
Howard	36.9	Allegany	38.8	Dorchester	40.9	Allegany	32.9	Allegany	49.4	Cecil	41.5
Baltimore Co	36.7	Caroline	35.9	Harford	37.6	Baltimore Co	31.1	Dorchester	45.5	Baltimore Co	39.8
Dorchester	35.4	Baltimore Co	35.0	Baltimore Co	37.0	Cecil	30.0	Caroline	45.3	Allegany	38.2
Kent	35.3	Saint Mary's	34.4	Cecil	35.3	Saint Mary's	29.7	Baltimore Co	44.4	Dorchester	35.2
Harford	34.4	Washington	33.9	Calvert	33.1	Dorchester	29.5	Saint Mary's	42.5	Saint Mary's	34.0
Talbot	33.3	Queen Anne's	32.1	Queen Anne's	31.7	Washington	28.9	Washington	40.1	Washington	32.6
Washington	33.1	Harford	31.0	Montgomery	31.6	Howard	27.4	Harford	39.2	Harford	32.5
Saint Mary's	32.5	Carroll	30.3	Washington	28.3	Harford	26.4	Carroll	34.1	Queen Anne's	32.1
Calvert	32.3	Wicomico	29.4	Anne Arundel	27.7	Calvert	23.5	Garrett	33.7	Carroll	28.3
Anne Arundel	30.1	Montgomery	29.2	Howard	26.4	Garrett	22.5	Queen Anne's	33.0	Calvert	27.8
Charles	30.0	Worcester	27.9	Wicomico	26.0	Montgomery	22.5	Howard	32.8	Montgomery	27.3
Montgomery	26.9	Calvert	27.8	Worcester	25.9	Wicomico	22.1	Calvert	32.6	Wicomico	26.4
STATE	25.4	Dorchester	26.1	Frederick	25.8	Carroll	21.6	Montgomery	32.6	Somerset	25.9
Caroline	25.0	Howard	25.9	STATE	24.5	STATE	20.7	Anne Arundel	30.9	Garrett	25.8
Wicomico	24.5	STATE	24.9	Allegany	24.1	Anne Arundel	20.6	STATE	30.7	STATE	25.7
Allegany	23.9	Frederick	24.5	Carroll	22.7	Frederick	20.2	Wicomico	30.7	Anne Arundel	25.5
Frederick	23.6	Anne Arundel	23.2	Kent	18.2	Worcester	19.1	Frederick	30.0	Frederick	25.5
Queen Anne's	22.4	Garrett	21.3	Charles	17.8	Kent	18.9	Kent	27.0	Howard	24.7
Carroll	21.8	Charles	19.6	Caroline	17.6	Charles	16.0	Talbot	26.2	Kent	24.3
Garrett	21.4	Kent	16.2	Prince George's	15.6	Queen Anne's	16.0	Charles	22.4	Talbot	21.4
Worcester	18.0	Prince George's	16.2	Garrett	14.1	Somerset	14.8	Prince George's	19.9	Charles	19.6
Somerset	14.3	Talbot	9.5	Talbot	6.3	Talbot	14.3	Worcester	19.1	Prince George's	17.3
Prince George's	14.2	Baltimore City	7.4	Baltimore City	6.0	Prince George's	11.0	Somerset	18.5	Worcester	14.7
Baltimore City	5.6	Somerset	7.4	Somerset	0.0	Baltimore City	6.9	Baltimore City	11.5	Baltimore City	8.1

EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES RANKED BY PERCENT AT SATISFACTORY MSPAP 2000-2001 RESULTS BY LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM

Local School System	Reading	Local School System	Writing	Local School System	Lang. Use.	Local School System	Math	Local School System	Science	Local School System	Social Studies
Howard	14.2	Somerset	55.6	Montgomery	24.3	Somerset	33.3	Kent	36.4	Somerset	38.9
Harford	13.3	Harford	32.7	Harford	22.3	Howard	29.3	Harford	33.4	Calvert	28.3
Somerset	12.5	Frederick	27.9	Somerset	22.2	Garrett	27.4	Howard	33.1	Howard	27.4
Calvert	12.2	Howard	26.4	Howard	22.1	Frederick	27.1	Calvert	33.0	Garrett	25.8
Worcester	11.1	Calvert	26.2	Frederick	21.6	Montgomery	24.8	Frederick	30.8	Harford	25.6
Montgomery	11.0	Garrett	25.8	Calvert	18.9	Carroll	24.1	Carroll	30.0	Carroll	22.8
Charles	10.0	Montgomery	25.4	Baltimore Co	16.4	Harford	23.3	Somerset	27.8	Worcester	22.6
Washington	9.6	Baltimore Co	24.5	Carroll	14.7	Calvert	21.5	Worcester	27.4	Baltimore Co	22.5
Frederick	9.3	Queen Anne's	23.3	Saint Mary's	13.6	Worcester	19.4	Montgomery	25.3	Frederick	22.2
Kent	9.1	Carroll	21.3	Anne Arundel	13.2	Baltimore Co	19.0	Baltimore Co	24.5	Montgomery	20.2
Queen Anne's	7.8	Wicomico	19.8	STATE	13.0	Saint Mary's	18.4	Wicomico	23.1	Wicomico	17.6
Baltimore Co	7.6	STATE	19.4	Queen Anne's	12.2	Washington	18.2	Queen Anne's	22.2	Anne Arundel	16.0
STATE	7.2	Washington	19.0	Washington	11.8	STATE	16.0	STATE	19.2	STATE	15.8
Saint Mary's	7.0	Anne Arundel	18.8	Caroline	11.1	Anne Arundel	15.9	Anne Arundel	18.7	Saint Mary's	15.6
Carroll	6.8	Caroline	18.4	Cecil	10.3	Charles	12.8	Charles	18.3	Charles	13.8
Anne Arundel	6.1	Kent	18.2	Wicomico	9.9	Queen Anne's	12.2	Garrett	17.7	Kent	13.6
Dorchester	5.6	Saint Mary's	17.7	Charles	9.4	Cecil	11.1	Cecil	17.2	Washington	13.6
Wicomico	4.9	Worcester	17.7	Allegany	6.6	Wicomico	9.9	Washington	15.7	Talbot	13.0
Allegany	4.8	Charles	17.0	Dorchester	6.5	Kent	9.1	Saint Mary's	14.3	Queen Anne's	12.2
Caroline	4.8	Cecil	15.7	Worcester	6.4	Talbot	8.7	Caroline	12.2	Dorchester	11.9
Prince George's	3.6	Talbot	13.0	Prince George's	6.2	Allegany	6.2	Allegany	11.3	Cecil	10.6
Garrett	3.0	Dorchester	11.9	Garrett	6.1	Prince George's	5.7	Talbot	10.9	Allegany	9.3
Cecil	1.9	Prince George's	11.9	Talbot	5.6	Caroline	4.1	Dorchester	9.5	Prince George's	6.4
Baltimore City	1.0	Allegany	9.3	Kent	4.8	Dorchester	2.4	Prince George's	7.5	Caroline	6.1
Talbot	0.0	Baltimore City	5.7	Baltimore City	2.1	Baltimore City	1.9	Baltimore City	2.3	Baltimore City	2.6

SECOND GRADE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS 2000-2001 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK (1.1.5)

	Reading	Language	Math	Language Mechanics	Math Computation
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	58	60	60	66	68
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	34	27	29	40	40
Local School System					
Allegany	27	30	32	38	36
Anne Arundel	35	26	31	45	31
Baltimore City	24	18	15	27	24
Baltimore Co.	42	33	36	49	62
Calvert	39	40	47	50	66
Caroline	17	18	18	33	19
Carroll	27	23	29	38	36
Cecil	55	43	52	55	58
Charles	40	33	37	56	46
Dorchester	22	16	9	20	18
Frederick	31	26	31	37	26
Garrett	33	39	48	45	42
Harford	46	39	38	40	43
Howard	28	27	23	42	33
Kent	32	23	39	57	56
Montgomery	34	27	29	45	40
Prince George's	30	22	23	27	32
Queen Anne's	35	24	29	38	44
Saint Mary's	32	23	25	28	36
Somerset	58	37	26	38	20
Talbot	26	24	16	24	19
Washington	30	28	44	56	50
Wicomico	33	36	46	45	54
Worcester	37	37	47	47	63

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of 0.5% gain over previous year.

FOURTH GRADE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS 2000-2001 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK (1.1.5)

	Reading	Language	Math	Language Mechanics	Math Computation
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	59	61	59	61	62
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	31	27	23	27	31
Local School System					
Allegany	28	28	23	27	26
Anne Arundel	27	24	25	26	30
Baltimore City	14	13	12	15	18
Baltimore Co.	33	30	28	35	37
Calvert	37	37	33	35	45
Caroline	16	13	21	24	30
Carroll	28	26	27	33	26
Cecil	44	42	42	47	40
Charles	30	27	25	26	31
Dorchester	24	22	14	21	38
Frederick	32	28	30	27	25
Garrett	32	27	34	32	25
Harford	41	34	31	30	36
Howard	39	38	27	30	21
Kent	36	34	49	30	43
Montgomery	45	40	37	40	45
Prince George's	25	22	14	21	25
Queen Anne's	35	26	23	31	22
Saint Mary's	28	23	23	27	33
Somerset	59	23	8	16	17
Talbot	23	20	15	24	27
Washington	22	22	23	26	31
Wicomico	26	22	23	35	32
Worcester	26	28	27	33	33

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of 0.5% gain over previous year.

SIXTH GRADE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS 2000-2001 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK (1.1.5)

	Reading	Language	Math	Language Mechanics	Math Computation
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	58	57	60	53	68
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	19	20	18	17	25
Local School System					
Allegany	20	21	19	18	20
Anne Arundel	16	17	16	17	19
Baltimore City	8	7	8	10	19
Baltimore Co.	20	22	20	19	27
Calvert	27	26	24	23	25
Caroline	13	12	12	21	23
Carroll	24	26	25	23	26
Cecil	32	30	25	29	31
Charles	14	18	19	14	25
Dorchester	4	7	5	7	14
Frederick	27	25	27	23	25
Garrett	30	29	20	17	30
Harford	29	25	24	26	21
Howard	26	28	24	26	29
Kent	9	16	19	29	18
Montgomery	27	29	31	22	42
Prince George's	17	20	14	14	25
Queen Anne's	22	18	18	17	28
Saint Mary's	12	16	15	14	20
Somerset	61	23	10	14	14
Talbot	17	15	10	16	23
Washington	21	20	18	17	25
Wicomico	23	22	17	22	19
Worcester	18	16	15	18	31

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of 0.5% gain over previous year.

Trend Results for Goal Indicator 1.1.6

1.1.6 The percentage of time that students with disabilities participate in general education classrooms will increase by 2% annually.

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AGES 6 THROUGH 21 IN GENERAL EDUCATION CLASSROOMS (1.1.6)

		Dec. 1, 2000			Dec. 1, 2001	
Local School System	Out <21%	Out 21-60%	Out >60%	Out <21%	Out 21-60%	Out >60%
Allegany	46.13	47.43	2.13	43.39	38.69	1.22
Anne Arundel	55.80	18.02	16.44	52.90	14.94	13.96
Baltimore City	26.93	13.25	48.40	29.52	17.99	33.74
Edison Schools	37.58	8.92	53.50	46.99	9.84	37.16
Baltimore County	46.31	20.04	25.21	42.06	15.61	24.41
Calvert	42.38	28.86	22.38	40.63	29.36	14.93
Caroline	55.40	35.25	8.49	51.68	29.13	7.56
Carroll	77.16	12.59	5.95	66.85	13.91	6.46
Cecil	56.48	26.90	14.64	54.22	20.72	13.35
Charles	52.10	21.40	22.38	47.11	20.68	18.08
Dorchester	75.52	11.72	12.07	71.03	8.57	11.84
Frederick	63.68	21.76	9.49	66.37	15.10	6.66
Garrett	46.56	34.64	18.23	47.64	27.19	18.03
Harford	49.23	41.31	4.70	41.01	39.88	4.29
Howard	48.46	38.19	7.50	41.74	33.04	6.09
Kent	55.52	27.30	16.26	55.65	17.56	20.24
Montgomery	37.68	21.07	32.95	35.43	18.83	29.11
Prince George's	42.58	26.28	20.47	39.43	23.24	18.94
Queen Anne's	45.26	49.29	3.60	64.52	20.27	2.44
Saint Mary's	53.08	31.26	14.38	47.85	29.75	11.79
Somerset	69.38	13.01	15.45	66.93	13.07	11.47
Talbot	57.54	21.57	9.15	60.13	21.31	8.23
Washington	74.15	12.61	6.07	69.09	11.28	4.92
Wicomico	55.80	12.37	19.96	61.41	11.32	16.50
Worcester	67.35	22.41	10.24	66.44	15.65	7.55
STATE AVERAGE	46.51	22.55	23.23	44.06	20.49	19.07

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of a 2-percentage point improvement over previous year. Source: Maryland Special Education Census Data, Dec. 1 Child Count

NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AGES 3 THROUGH 5 IN PRESCHOOL LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENTS (1.1.6)

	Home		Itine	erant	Reverse M	Reverse Mainstreaming		
Local School System	Dec. 2000	Dec. 2001	Dec. 2000	Dec. 2001	Dec. 2000	Dec. 2001		
Allegany	0	0	111	98	0	0		
Anne Arundel	34	10	277	336	8	8		
Baltimore City	49	78	344	359	*	23		
Edison Schools	0	0	0	*	0	0		
Baltimore County	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Calvert	*	*	86	41	0	0		
Caroline	0	0	33	30	0	0		
Carroll	0	6	79	127	0	0		
Cecil	0	0	28	34	0	0		
Charles	*	*	134	171	0	*		
Dorchester	0	*	11	6	0	0		
Frederick	11	*	52	151	*	0		
Garrett	*	0	0	0	0	0		
Harford	*	10	29	19	0	0		
Howard	*	*	141	216	9	19		
Kent	0	0	0	*	0	12		
Montgomery	*	5	670	587	0	0		
Prince George's	*	5	295	280	31	0		
Queen Anne's	*	0	11	12	0	0		
Saint Mary's	*	*	20	25	0	0		
Somerset	*	0	0	0	0	0		
Talbot	0	*	0	0	*	0		
Washington	*	0	24	37	*	*		
Wicomico	*	*	140	93	0	0		
Worcester	*	0	28	28	0	0		
STATE TOTAL	120	129	2,513	2,652	56	67		

^{*} Fewer than 5 students

Home - includes preschooler for whom it is appropriate to receive services at home, not single service.

Itinerant - includes preschooler who receives only speech and/or language at school or other location.

Reverse Mainstreaming - includes preschooler who receives special education in class designed for disabled student where over 50% of the students are not disabled.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AGES 3 THROUGH 5 IN PRESCHOOL LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENTS (1.1.6)

(continued)	Early Childhood		Early Childho	od Special Ed.	Com	Combined		
Local School System	Dec. 2000	Dec. 2001	Dec. 2000	Dec. 2001	Dec. 2000	Dec. 2001		
Allegany	33	85	13	25	38	25		
Anne Arundel	202	237	214	270	68	73		
Baltimore City	425	467	306	311	61	23		
Edison Schools	13	10	*	0	*	0		
Baltimore County	755	870	35	505	644	75		
Calvert	69	83	41	25	30	42		
Caroline	18	25	26	18	5	*		
Carroll	100	80	85	83	5	13		
Cecil	130	126	76	92	*	0		
Charles	85	105	*	*	*	*		
Dorchester	9	24	18	19	7	*		
Frederick	146	139	87	38	60	19		
Garrett	73	51	0	0	0	0		
Harford	226	234	208	187	108	170		
Howard	97	55	274	277	61	104		
Kent	11	*	9	0	*	*		
Montgomery	111	267	597	598	5	29		
Prince George's	41	13	199	566	648	370		
Queen Anne's	48	40	31	17	*	43		
Saint Mary's	108	90	29	31	31	56		
Somerset	19	17	7	*	0	0		
Talbot	43	38	0	0	*	*		
Washington	165	156	5	6	52	27		
Wicomico	27	19	44	47	*	5		
Worcester	*	23	15	12	24	27		
STATE TOTAL	2,958	3,257	2,323	3,135	1,860	1,114		

^{*} Fewer than 5 students

Early Childhood - includes preschooler who receives all special education and related services in educational programs designed primarily for children without disabilities.

Early Childhood Special Ed. - includes preschooler who receives all of their special education and related services in educational programs designed primarily for children with disabilities housed in regular school buildings or other community-based settings.

Combined (part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education setting) - includes preschooler who receives services in multiple settings.

Trend Results for Goal Indicator 1.1.7

1.1.7 The percentage of students with disabilities who receive high school diplomas will increase by 2%.

STATEWIDE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RECEIVING DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES (1.1.7)

	1998-1999	1998-1999	1999-2000	1999-2000	2000-2001	2000-2001	
	Diplomas*	Certificates**	Diplomas*	Certificates**	Diplomas*	Certificates**	
STATE AVERAGE	98.7	1.3	99.0	1.0	99.3	0.7	
LSS							
Allegany	98.7	1.3	97.8	2.2	99.3	0.7	
Anne Arundel	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Baltimore City	95.5	4.5	97.6	2.4	99.5	0.5	
Baltimore County	98.7	1.3	99.2	0.8	99.4	0.6	
Calvert	99.1	0.9	99.6	0.4	99.9	0.1	
Caroline	98.7	1.3	99.1	0.9	98.1	1.9	
Carroll	99.2	0.8	98.8	1.2	99.4	0.6	
Cecil	97.5	2.5	98.8	1.2	98.3	1.7	
Charles	99.4	0.6	99.0	1.0	98.9	1.1	
Dorchester	96.9	3.1	97.4	2.6	97.6	2.4	
Frederick	99.8	0.2	100.0	0.0	99.7	0.3	
Garrett	99.7	0.3	99.0	1.0	99.0	1.0	
Harford	100.0	0.0	99.9	0.1	99.8	0.2	
Howard	99.3	0.7	99.2	0.8	99.2	0.8	
Kent	98.6	1.4	99.4	0.6	100.0	0.0	
Montgomery	98.9	1.1	98.7	1.3	98.9	1.1	
Prince George's	98.9	1.1	99.0	1.0	99.2	0.8	
Queen Anne's	93.0	7.0	99.5	0.5	99.3	0.7	
Saint Mary's	99.3	0.7	98.9	1.1	99.3	0.7	
Somerset	97.3	2.7	100.0	0.0	98.9	1.2	
Talbot	95.9	4.1	98.1	1.9	95.0	5.0	
Washington	98.5	1.5	98.3	1.7	98.9	1.1	
Wicomico	98.5	1.5	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Worcester	99.5	0.5	98.8	1.2	99.6	0.4	

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of 0.2% gain (Diplomas), 0.2% reduction (Certificates) over previous year.

^{*} Includes both general and special education students receiving a diploma as reported in the Maryland School Performance Report

 $^{^{**}}$ I ncludes special education students only

SELECTED EXIT DATA FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES* JUNE 1999 - JULY 2001

	Total SWD Exiting HS		Percent Graduating with a Diploma		Percent Receiving a Certificate		Percent Dropping Out	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
STATE AVERAGE	8,540	8,916	35.8	37.2	5.2	3.9	13.2	15.9
Local School System								
Allegany	150	165	36.0	41.2	9.3	7.9	20.0	16.4
Anne Arundel	968	1,038	43.4	36.0	2.9	2.6	16.4	23.2
Baltimore City	1,708	1,564	14.7	19.2	6.4	3.2	20.3	26.5
Baltimore County	1,153	1,044	39.3	47.9	3.7	1.8	8.8	9.5
Calvert	183	204	27.3	25.0	3.8	1.0	16.4	20.6
Caroline	58	72	31.0	40.3	3.4	4.2	12.1	18.1
Carroll	300	295	45.3	45.1	4.0	4.1	17.3	15.6
Cecil	187	212	26.2	31.6	3.2	6.1	31.6	25.9
Charles	266	362	35.3	29.3	3.4	3.9	14.7	15.5
Dorchester	66	51	16.7	25.5	12.1	15.7	24.2	17.6
Frederick	486	386	44.7	49.5	2.5	3.1	6.8	1.8
Garrett	69	72	30.4	26.4	4.3	4.2	26.1	30.6
Harford	187	247	50.3	51.4	7.0	4.0	16.0	13.8
Howard	424	429	41.3	48.0	3.1	2.8	9.7	7.5
Kent	36	34	36.1	44.1	2.8	2.9	30.6	26.5
Montgomery	1,174	1,273	37.9	49.2	5.2	5.0	3.2	3.1
Prince George's	414	595	62.3	30.1	12.1	5.0	4.3	15.6
Queen Anne's	117	80	35.9	18.8	0.9	2.5	18.8	22.5
Saint Mary's	141	167	39.0	39.5	7.1	3.6	15.6	16.8
Somerset	45	49	46.7	26.5	0.0	6.1	15.6	18.4
Talbot	56	56	28.6	17.9	3.6	23.2	14.3	25.0
Washington	153	268	62.1	45.5	13.7	6.7	2.6	20.1
Wicomico	129	181	34.1	26.5	10.9	6.1	19.4	26.0
Worcester	70	72	37.1	50.0	8.6	5.6	10.0	8.3

^{*} As reported in Table 18, Students with Disabilities by Exit Reason and LEA, Age 14-21, July 2000-June 2001 (Source: Dec. 1 Child Count)

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

Objective 1-2

To organize, analyze, and report data on post-high school employment and participation in post-secondary education among students with disabilities.

Indicators 1-2

- **1.2.1** Post-high school employment of students with disabilities will increase by 2% annually.
- **1.2.2** Participation of students with disabilities in post-secondary education will increase annually.

NOTE: At this time, no data is available on participation of SWD in post-secondary education. The Maryland State Department of Education is currently developing a process for collecting and reporting this data.

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

Objective 1-3

To organize, analyze, and report data on the performance of eligible students on alternative assessments.

Indicators 1-3

- 1.3.1 The percent satisfactory on IMAP will increase by 3% annually (For example, if 40% of students achieved satisfactory during the previous year, then 3% more would have to achieve satisfactory the next year, for a total of 43%, to meet the MSIG annual goal).
- **1.3.2** By 2001, no student in Maryland will be exempted or excluded from statewide performance assessments.

Computation Methodology

Identify the percent of students with disabilities at the satisfactory performance level on the Independence Mastery Assessment Program (IMAP) at each grade level, 3rd, 5th, 8th and 11th. Compare current results with the previous year and determine if there was a 3-percentage point gain. Satisfactory percentages are:

IMAP Grades 3, 5, 8 and 11								
Satisfactory	Due to the current restructuring of I MAP, standards have not yet been established. Results cannot be compared to previous years.							

INDEPENDENCE MASTERY ASSESSMENT PROGRAM 2001 RESULTS BY LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM (1.3.1)

	Composite Score	Standard Deviation	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	No. of Students
STATE AVERAGE*	60.06	23.13	0.00	93.00	2117
Local School System					
Allegany	71.66	12.56	0.00	87.00	58
Anne Arundel	57.71	18.09	0.00	86.80	161
Baltimore City	59.75	18.03	0.00	88.80	311
Baltimore County	69.00	12.96	0.00	88.00	332
Calvert	66.53	14.39	24.00	85.67	29
Caroline	74.04	7.15	57.65	83.68	13
Carroll	57.08	18.87	0.00	83.16	53
Cecil	61.86	14.39	16.00	82.32	37
Charles	65.44	16.89	0.00	85.00	38
Dorchester	76.10	4.92	64.65	85.49	20
Frederick	72.71	12.56	0.00	85.64	60
Garrett	77.09	12.20	37.00	83.83	15
Harford	65.31	15.10	0.00	82.00	68
Howard	65.00	19.45	0.00	87.00	114
Kent	65.29	6.28	55.16	71.66	5
Montgomery	60.94	21.97	0.00	93.00	298
Prince George's	35.78	33.84	0.00	87.00	292
Queen Anne's	64.35	28.75	0.00	82.66	7
Saint Mary's	66.64	16.17	0.00	84.97	27
Somerset	57.35	18.04	36.32	87.00	12
Talbot	76.89	15.60	32.00	92.00	12
Washington	60.38	15.47	0.00	83.48	65
Wicomico	62.66	23.94	0.00	84.10	76
Worcester	81.23	6.15	63.32	86.67	14
School for Blind*	63.73	12.21	34.00	81.00	32

 $^{^{\}star}$ $\,$ School for the Blind is not included in State averages

Note: due to scoring revisions, no comparison with previous years' data can be made

MARYLAND STATE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES EXEMPTED FROM MSPAP* (1.3.2)

		Grade 3			Grade 5			Grade 8	
Local School System	1999	2000	2001	1999	2000	2001	1999	2000	2001
Allegany	4.09	4.57	4.04	5.28	4.30	4.13	2.25	1.18	1.34
Anne Arundel	3.61	3.50	2.77	4.06	3.49	3.15	1.87	2.09	2.31
Baltimore City	3.15	2.81	2.38	3.22	2.82	2.77	2.15	1.57	1.98
Baltimore Co.	3.22	1.66	2.29	3.87	1.93	2.76	2.89	1.81	1.36
Calvert	1.27	1.56	1.31	1.04	1.54	1.36	0.50	0.67	0.92
Caroline	4.44	4.00	3.48	4.50	3.76	2.72	1.87	0.38	2.40
Carroll	3.54	2.72	2.59	4.46	2.56	2.89	2.30	1.49	0.97
Cecil	3.61	4.55	3.31	3.92	4.89	4.85	1.50	1.84	1.79
Charles	2.56	2.02	2.42	2.96	2.22	3.00	2.25	2.63	2.78
Dorchester	3.52	4.28	4.26	2.97	4.52	4.20	4.00	3.57	2.74
Frederick	2.52	1.97	1.97	2.44	1.85	2.04	1.51	0.86	1.18
Garrett	2.59	3.28	3.02	3.25	3.96	3.36	2.01	2.14	2.27
Harford	3.22	2.84	2.49	2.70	2.51	2.90	1.03	1.06	1.24
Howard	1.53	1.78	1.54	1.35	1.92	1.74	1.15	1.25	1.42
Kent	4.68	4.17	3.62	1.72	2.32	2.23	1.83	1.29	1.42
Montgomery	3.85	3.60	2.50	3.46	3.58	2.99	2.18	2.40	2.25
Prince George's	2.86	2.65	2.05	2.45	2.66	2.49	1.35	1.21	1.28
Queen Anne's	5.26	3.82	4.22	3.26	3.05	3.94	1.69	3.23	2.14
Saint Mary's	4.33	3.09	1.36	4.56	3.09	1.51	3.34	3.61	1.11
Somerset	2.85	3.12	1.68	1.50	0.93	2.78	3.81	1.63	1.42
Talbot	5.42	3.14	3.66	4.45	4.82	2.63	2.78	3.03	4.08
Washington	3.33	2.78	2.56	3.56	2.91	3.04	2.54	1.87	3.07
Wicomico	3.45	3.82	2.48	3.18	4.03	3.35	2.29	1.81	1.05
Worcester	0.10	0.10	0.17	0.34	0.18	0.73	1.30	0.62	1.25
STATE AVERAGE	3.51	2.77	2.35	3.44	2.88	2.75	2.51	1.73	1.73

^{*} See Appendix A for LSS Detail (includes students whose accommodations invalidated their scores for one or more content areas and those whose I EPs exempted them from MSPAP)

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

Objective 1-4

Within local school systems, the significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions for students with disabilities as compared to the general student population will decrease.

Indicators 1-4

- **1.4.1** Within local school systems, the percentage of students with disabilities receiving long-term suspensions will decrease annually to reduce the significant discrepancy.
- **1.4.2** Within local school systems, the percentage of students with disabilities receiving short-term suspensions will decrease annually to reduce the significant discrepancy.
- **1.4.3** Functional behavioral assessments (as defined) will decrease by 10% annually.
- **1.4.4** Placements of students in non-general education classrooms will decrease by 10% annually.

LONG-TERM SUSPENSIONS (GREATER THAN 10 DAYS) OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

BY LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM, 2000-2001 (1.4.1)

	-	All Students		Stude	nts with Disa	bilities	Student	s Without Dis	Students Without Disabilities			
	Total Enrollment 9/30/00	Number	Percent	SSIS Count 12/1/00	Number	Percent	Total Enrollment 9/30/00	Number	Percent			
STATE	852,920	3,767	0.44	111,102	899	0.81	741,818	2,868	0.39			
Allegany	10,416	5	0.05	1,888	0	0.00	8,528	5	0.06			
Anne Arundel	74,491	316	0.42	10,072	136	1.35	64,419	180	0.28			
Baltimore City	98,226	603	0.61	16,679	167	1.00	81,547	436	0.53			
Edison Schools	1,633	*	0.24	177	0	0.00	1,456	*	0.27			
Baltimore Co.	106,898	1,117	1.04	13,260	244	1.84	93,638	873	0.93			
Calvert	16,170	*	0.01	2,159	0	0.00	14,011	*	0.01			
Caroline	5,557	0	0.00	777	0	0.00	4,780	0	0.00			
Carroll	27,528	0	0.00	3,763	0	0.00	23,765	0	0.00			
Cecil	15,905	48	0.30	2,558	*	0.16	13,347	44	0.33			
Charles	23,468	58	0.25	2,671	21	0.79	20,797	37	0.18			
Dorchester	4,869	39	0.80	625	9	1.44	4,244	30	0.71			
Frederick	36,885	25	0.07	4,466	7	0.16	32,419	18	0.06			
Garrett	4,946	0	0.00	789	0	0.00	4,157	0	0.00			
Harford	39,520	321	0.81	5,678	100	1.76	33,842	221	0.65			
Howard	44,946	116	0.26	4,653	25	0.54	40,293	91	0.23			
Kent	2,795	6	0.21	347	0	0.00	2,448	6	0.25			
Montgomery	134,180	198	0.15	16,359	21	0.13	117,821	117	0.15			
Prince George's	133,723	825	0.62	14,623	150	1.03	119,100	675	0.57			
Queen Anne's	7,217	19	0.26	1,010	*	0.10	6,207	18	0.29			
Saint Mary's	15,151	*	0.02	2,073	0	0.00	13,078	*	0.02			
Somerset	3,063	0	0.00	396	0	0.00	2,667	0	0.00			
Talbot	4,521	*	0.09	504	0	0.00	4,017	*	0.10			
Washington	19,782	56	0.28	2,969	14	0.47	16,813	42	0.25			
Wicomico	14,138	*	0.02	1,704	0	0.00	12,434	*	0.02			
Worcester	6,892	0	0.00	902	0	0.00	5,990	0	0.00			

^{*} Fewer than 5 students

MULTIPLE SUSPENSIONS SUMMING TO GREATER THAN 10 DAYS OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES BY LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM, 2000-2001

		All Students		Stude	nts with Disa	bilities	Student	s Without Di	sabilities
	Total Enrollment 9/30/00	Number	Percent	SSIS Count 12/1/00	Number	Percent	Total Enrollment 9/30/00	Number	Percent
STATE	852,920	6,379	0.75	111,102	1,492	1.34	741,818	4,907	0.66
Allegany	10,416	72	0.69	1,888	28	1.48	8,528	44	0.52
Anne Arundel	74,491	403	0.54	10,072	89	0.88	64,419	314	0.49
Baltimore City	98,226	1,604	1.63	16,679	378	2.27	81,547	1,238	1.52
Edison Schools	1,633	18	1.10	177	0	0.00	1,456	18	1.23
Baltimore Co.	106,898	413	0.39	13,260	66	0.50	93,638	347	0.37
Calvert	16,170	115	0.71	2,159	25	1.16	14,011	90	0.64
Caroline	5,557	80	1.44	777	31	3.99	4,780	50	1.05
Carroll	27,528	98	0.36	3,763	37	0.98	23,765	61	0.26
Cecil	15,905	222	1.40	2,558	8	0.31	13,347	214	1.60
Charles	23,468	146	0.62	2,671	34	1.27	20,797	112	0.54
Dorchester	4,869	112	2.30	625	26	4.16	4,244	86	2.03
Frederick	36,885	282	0.76	4,466	123	2.75	32,419	159	0.49
Garrett	4,946	9	0.18	789	*	0.51	4,157	5	0.12
Harford	39,520	470	1.19	5,678	176	3.10	33,842	295	0.87
Howard	44,946	134	0.30	4,653	20	0.43	40,293	114	0.28
Kent	2,795	33	1.18	347	*	0.29	2,448	32	1.31
Montgomery	134,180	287	0.21	16,359	90	0.55	117,821	202	0.17
Prince George's	133,723	1,058	0.79	14,623	214	1.46	119,100	844	0.71
Queen Anne's	7,217	40	0.55	1,010	13	1.29	6,207	27	0.43
Saint Mary's	15,151	238	1.57	2,073	31	1.50	13,078	207	1.58
Somerset	3,063	81	2.64	396	12	3.03	2,667	69	2.59
Talbot	4,521	37	0.82	504	9	1.79	4,017	28	0.70
Washington	19,782	34	0.17	2,969	5	0.17	16,813	29	0.17
Wicomico	14,138	333	2.36	1,704	66	3.87	12,434	268	2.16
Worcester	6,892	60	0.87	902	6	0.67	5,990	54	0.90

^{*} Fewer than 5 students

SHORT-TERM SUSPENSIONS (BETWEEN 1 AND 10 DAYS) OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

BY LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM, 2000-2001 (1.4.2)

	,	All Students		Stude	nts with Disa	bilities	Student	s Without Di	sabilities
	Total Enrollment 9/30/00	Number	Percent	SSIS Count 12/1/00	Number	Percent	Total Enrollment 9/30/00	Number	Percent
STATE	852,920	68,648	8.05	111,102	16,855	15.17	741,898	51,793	6.98
Allegany	10,416	544	5.22	1,888	213	11.28	8,528	331	3.88
Anne Arundel	74,491	6,763	9.08	10,072	1,981	19.67	64,420	4,782	7.42
Baltimore City	98,226	14,458	14.72	16,679	3,607	21.63	81,613	10,851	13.31
Edison Schools	1,633	334	20.45	177	38	21.47	1,462	296	20.33
Baltimore Co.	106,898	10,095	9.44	13,260	2,347	17.70	93,643	7,748	8.27
Calvert	16,170	1,002	6.20	2,159	237	10.98	14,011	765	5.46
Caroline	5,557	734	13.21	777	196	25.23	4,780	538	11.26
Carroll	27,528	1,248	4.53	3,763	427	11.35	23,766	821	3.45
Cecil	15,905	1,916	12.05	2,558	187	7.31	13,347	1,729	12.95
Charles	23,468	2,523	10.75	2,671	684	25.61	20,797	1,839	8.84
Dorchester	4,869	728	14.95	625	145	23.20	4,244	583	13.74
Frederick	36,885	2,630	7.13	4,466	1,035	23.18	32,419	1,595	4.92
Garrett	4,946	225	4.55	789	100	12.67	4,157	125	3.01
Harford	39,520	2,704	6.84	5,678	737	12.98	33,842	1,967	5.81
Howard	44,946	1,930	4.29	4,653	464	9.97	40,293	1,466	3.64
Kent	2,795	314	11.23	347	46	13.26	2,448	268	10.95
Montgomery	134,180	4,734	3.53	16,359	1,290	7.89	117,821	3,444	2.92
Prince George's	133,723	9,601	7.18	14,623	1,767	12.08	119,100	7,834	6.58
Queen Anne's	7,217	480	6.65	1,010	156	15.45	6,207	324	5.22
Saint Mary's	15,151	1,463	9.66	2,073	338	16.30	13,078	1,125	8.60
Somerset	3,063	547	17.86	396	90	22.73	2,667	457	17.14
Talbot	4,521	336	7.43	504	80	15.87	4,017	256	6.37
Washington	19,782	967	4.89	2,969	242	8.15	16,814	725	4.31
Wicomico	14,138	1,835	12.98	1,704	326	19.13	12,434	1,509	12.14
Worcester	6,892	537	7.79	902	122	13.53	5,990	415	6.93

FUNCTIONAL BEHAVIORAL ASSESSMENTS AND INTERVENTION PLANS (1.4.3)

	20	00	20	01
	ASSESSMENTS	FUNCTIONAL PLANS	ASSESSMENTS	FUNCTIONAL PLANS
STATE Totals	3,625	3,457	4,775	4,576
Local School System	ns			
Allegany	91	91	125	125
Anne Arundel	77	73	61	58
Baltimore City	650	650	1316	1316
Baltimore County	0	0	46	29
Calvert	26	21	41	34
Caroline	28	28	34	32
Carroll	244	222	251	240
Cecil	231	226	265	264
Charles	257	247	286	275
Dorchester	24	23	27	25
Frederick	216	205	0	0
Garrett	31	31	26	26
Harford	53	19	96	52
Howard	142	134	208	198
Kent	*	*	6	6
Montgomery	761	713	844	782
Prince George's	539	539	761	761
Queen Anne's	29	27	22	21
Saint Mary's	34	32	66	59
Somerset	15	12	20	17
Talbot	*	*	45	43
Washington	19	19	38	37
Wicomico	39	38	76	70
Worcester	57	57	55	55
MD Sch. Blind	18	17	24	23

^{*} Fewer than 5 students

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN NON-GENERAL EDUCATION CLASSROOMS (1.4.4)

Local School System	Dec. 1, 1998	Dec. 1, 1999	Dec. 1, 2000	Dec. 1, 2001
Allegany	.91	3.31	3.87	4.39
Anne Arundel	9.24	9.06	9.30	9.35
Baltimore City	11.27	10.61	10.90	11.44
Edison Schools	N/A	N/A	0.00	0.00
Baltimore County	7.15	7.78	7.53	7.02
Calvert	6.88	6.06	5.84	6.32
Caroline	0.75	0.77	0.77	0.84
Carroll	2.92	3.21	3.99	4.66
Cecil	1.27	1.42	1.80	2.03
Charles	2.75	3.96	4.30	3.10
Dorchester	0.15	0.31	0.64	0.31
Frederick	4.02	4.66	4.90	4.23
Garrett	0.13	0.53	0.89	0.27
Harford	4.16	4.50	4.35	4.31
Howard	4.57	4.64	5.20	5.24
Kent	0.57	0.59	0.86	1.19
Montgomery	6.06	6.08	7.62	7.65
Prince George's	14.06	11.92	9.79	10.11
Queen Anne's	2.08	1.32	1.88	1.85
Saint Mary's	0.98	0.97	1.16	1.08
Somerset	0.73	0.50	2.27	2.93
Talbot	0.18	0.00	1.59	2.11
Washington	5.97	6.31	6.26	6.91
Wicomico	0.25	0.48	0.82	0.95
Worcester	0.45	0.22	0.11	0.23
STATE AVERAGE	7.74	7.63	7.67	7.71

Source 12/1 Child Count. Includes: Home/Hospital/Public Day & Residential/Private Day & Residential Met MSIG Targeted Goal of 10% decrease over previous year.

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

Objective 1-5

To organize, analyze, and report data on attendance and dropout rates of students with disabilities.

Trend Results for Goal Indicators 1.5.1 and 1.5.2

- **1.5.1** Average attendance rates of students with disabilities will improve by .2% annually.
- **1.5.2** Dropout rates of students with disabilities will decrease by 0.5% annually.

ATTENDANCE RATES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS (1.5.1)

Local Cabaal Creaters	Grade	s 1-5	Grade	s 6-8	Grade	s 9-12
Local School System	1999-2000	2000-2001	1999-2000	2000-2001	1999-2000	2000-2001
Allegany	. 95.3	· 95.1	93.1	92.2	91.2	89.3
Anne Arundel	· 94.7	· 94.4	92.4	92.3	90.4	90.6
Baltimore City	93.0	92.6	85.0	84.6	74.8	73.7
Baltimore County	· 94.7	· 94.5	93.1	92.8	92.8	92.5
Calvert	· 95.0	· 94.9	93.9	93.9	92.9	92.6
Caroline	· 94.5	· 94.0	92.1	91.4	91.7	91.5
Carroll	· 95.2	· 95.0	· 94.1	· 94.4	92.4	92.7
Cecil	· 94.4	93.4	91.8	91.4	90.1	88.9
Charles	· 94.8	. 97.9	92.1	· 96.7	89.2	· 95.8
Dorchester	· 94.8	93.9	91.5	92.1	86.5	83.4
Frederick	· 94.3	· 94.1	92.0	91.5	89.3	89.1
Garrett	· 96.6	· 95.4	· 95.7	· 95.2	· 94.4	. 94.6
Harford	· 95.0	. 94.4	92.8	92.5	89.4	89.6
Howard	· 95.5	. 95.2	93.9	93.3	93.1	92.9
Kent	· 95.1	93.9	92.4	92.0	86.6	89.9
Montgomery	· 95.1	· 94.4	93.7	92.9	92.6	89.2
Prince George's	93.2	93.0	93.1	93.8	89.1	91.2
Queen Anne's	· 94.4	· 94.3	93.1	92.7	88.8	88.4
Saint Mary's	. 94.9	· 94.1	91.0	90.8	88.2	87.7
Somerset	· 94.4	93.3	91.8	92.9	88.8	92.8
Talbot	· 95.3	· 95.4	93.8	93.7	93.3	92.9
Washington	· 95.4	· 95.2	· 94.2	93.9	93.3	93.5
Wicomico	93.6	· 94.1	88.4	89.4	87.9	88.9
Worcester	· 94.6	· 94.4	93.8	93.4	92.0	91.7
STATE AVERAGE	94.4	94.1	91.6	91.6	88.8	88.5

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of a .2 percentage point increase over previous year.

[·] Met State satisfactory standard of 94%.

HIGH SCHOOL DROP-OUT RATES FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS (1.5.2)

		Dropouts, G	Grades 9-12	
	1999-	-2000	2000-	-2001
	Regular Education	Special Education	Regular Education	Special Education
STATE AVERAGE	3.95	3.46	3.85	4.41
Allegany	2.89	5.93	3.30	5.93
Anne Arundel	4.02	7.14	3.98	6.68
Baltimore City	11.67	∙ 1.54	11.53	10.12
Baltimore County	3.61	∙ 0.50	2.82	∙ 0.25
Calvert	3.70	∙ 0.24	3.92	∙ 0.87
Caroline	6.23	· 2.33	5.01	.0.00
Carroll	2.43	3.85	2.07	. 2.79
Cecil	5.50	∙ 0.00	4.18	. 0.96
Charles	4.39	∙0.00	3.65	.0.00
Dorchester	6.32	9.58	3.42	6.51
Frederick	2.27	4.84	2.27	7.00
Garrett	3.74	4.04	3.36	11.76
Harford	3.54	6.27	3.29	4.84
Howard	1.84	∙ 0.29	2.03	∙ 0.45
Kent	3.22	7.59	3.89	⋅1.35
Montgomery	1.59	. 2.85	1.58	· 2.38
Prince George's	2.38	· 1.43	3.08	⋅1.78
Queen Anne's	3.18	6.23	2.96	5.92
Saint Mary's	2.73	4.75	2.86	3.69
Somerset	5.01	4.20	6.87	11.29
Talbot	2.42	· 1.56	2.17	6.45
Washington	5.41	6.41	3.26	6.69
Wicomico	5.18	4.97	5.49	.0.00
Worcester	3.98	4.78	1.84	4.59

Met SIG Improvement Rate of 0.5% Annually, or maintained at 0.0%.

[·] Met State satisfactory standard of 3.0%.

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

Objective 1-6

Within local school systems, the percentage of African American students with disabilities and African American students in the total student population will be proportionate.

Indicators 1-6

- **1.6.1** Within local school systems, the disproportionate identification of African American students as students with a disability will decrease annually.
- 1.6.2 Within local school systems, the disproportionate identification of African American students as mentally retarded (MR), emotionally disturbed (ED), learning disabled (LD), and "other disabilities" (as an aggregated category) will decrease.

PERCENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS BY RACE, DEC. 1, 2000 (1.6.1)

	America			Pacific	African	American	Wh	ite	Hisp	anic
	/Alaskar	n Native		nder				T		
Local School System	Special	Regular	Special	Regular	Special	Regular	Special	Regular	Special	Regular
	Ed	Ed	Ed	Ed	Ed	Ed	Ed	Ed	Ed	Ed
Allegany	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.8	3.8	3.3	95.2	95.2	0.3	0.3
Anne Arundel	0.2	0.2	1.1	2.7	23.2	19.6	73.7	75.1	1.8	2.3
Baltimore City	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.6	84.5	87.3	14.4	11.0	0.4	0.7
Edison Schools	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	99.4	99.7	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.1
Baltimore Co.	0.5	0.5	1.5	3.8	32.3	32.4	64.2	61.7	1.5	1.7
Calvert	0.3	0.1	0.8	0.9	22.9	15.7	75.3	82.5	0.7	0.9
Caroline	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.8	26.3	20.0	72.7	77.1	1.0	2.0
Carroll	0.2	0.2	0.8	1.1	3.4	2.3	94.9	95.6	0.7	0.8
Cecil	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.8	6.9	5.9	91.2	91.4	1.6	1.7
Charles	1.4	1.0	1.4	2.2	42.2	35.0	53.8	59.9	1.2	1.9
Dorchester	0.6	0.2	1.1	1.0	54.2	42.3	43.5	55.6	0.5	0.9
Frederick	0.1	0.2	0.9	2.1	12.3	9.0	84.5	86.4	2.1	2.4
Garrett	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.9	0.3	98.9	99.5	0.1	0.1
Harford	0.1	0.5	1.1	2.0	15.0	14.0	82.6	81.3	1.2	2.2
Howard	0.3	0.2	3.6	9.6	23.7	17.8	70.0	69.9	2.5	2.5
Kent	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.5	36.9	26.7	62.2	70.0	0.6	2.6
Montgomery	0.3	0.3	5.6	13.3	26.6	21.2	50.7	49.0	16.7	16.2
Prince George's	0.5	0.5	1.6	3.3	77.2	77.2	14.9	11.4	5.9	7.5
Queen Anne's	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.6	16.1	10.6	83.2	88.1	0.1	0.4
Saint Mary's	0.8	0.6	0.7	2.0	24.3	19.2	72.6	76.4	1.5	1.8
Somerset	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.8	42.9	45.7	55.1	52.1	1.5	1.3
Talbot	0.6	0.2	0.0	1.2	37.3	24.6	60.5	72.1	1.6	1.9
Washington	0.2	0.2	0.5	1.3	7.8	7.5	90.3	89.6	1.1	1.4
Wicomico	0.8	0.1	0.8	2.3	39.3	35.3	58.2	60.2	0.9	2.2
Worcester	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.8	36.5	26.8	62.6	71.0	0.8	1.3
STATE AVERAGE	0.4	0.4	1.7	4.4	39.6	37.1	54.2	53.4	4.1	4.8

Source: Maryland Special Education Census Data, Dec. 1 Child Count

PERCENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS BY RACE, DEC. 1, 2001 (1.6.1)

	America /Alaskar	n Indian n Native		Pacific nder	African	American	Wh	ite	Hisp	oanic
Local School System	Special Ed	Regular Ed	Special Ed	Regular Ed	Special Ed	Regular Ed	Special Ed	Regular Ed	Special Ed	Regular Ed
Allegany	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.7	4.3	3.4	94.8	95.4	0.2	0.3
Anne Arundel	0.2	0.2	1.2	2.9	23.4	20.1	73.1	74.3	2.0	2.5
Baltimore City	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.6	85.1	87.7	13.9	10.4	0.5	0.9
Edison Schools	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.0	99.6	99.5	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2
Baltimore Co.	0.7	0.5	1.4	4.0	33.6	33.7	62.7	59.7	1.7	2.0
Calvert	0.3	0.1	0.8	0.9	23.7	15.7	74.4	82.2	0.7	1.0
Caroline	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.9	26.6	19.1	72.4	77.5	1.0	2.5
Carroll	0.3	0.2	0.9	1.1	3.7	2.4	94.1	95.4	1.0	0.9
Cecil	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.7	6.9	6.3	91.5	91.0	1.3	1.7
Charles	1.3	1.0	1.2	2.4	43.0	37.5	53.1	57.1	1.4	2.1
Dorchester	0.5	0.2	0.9	1.0	51.2	42.3	46.3	55.3	1.1	1.3
Frederick	0.1	0.2	1.1	2.4	12.5	9.1	83.9	85.5	2.3	2.9
Garrett	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.3	98.8	99.5	0.0	0.1
Harford	0.1	0.5	1.2	2.2	15.9	14.8	81.2	80.2	1.6	2.4
Howard	0.2	0.2	4.0	10.4	23.1	17.8	69.9	68.7	2.7	2.9
Kent	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.4	34.8	26.2	63.7	70.5	1.2	2.7
Montgomery	0.3	0.3	5.9	13.9	26.5	21.1	49.7	47.4	17.6	17.2
Prince George's	0.5	0.5	1.6	3.2	78.3	77.4	13.3	10.3	6.4	8.6
Queen Anne's	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.8	14.9	10.2	84.2	88.1	0.2	0.7
Saint Mary's	0.9	0.5	0.9	2.2	24.3	18.8	72.8	76.7	1.1	1.8
Somerset	0.5	0.1	0.8	0.9	42.7	45.9	54.9	51.3	1.1	1.6
Talbot	0.4	0.2	0.6	1.3	34.6	23.9	62.2	72.2	2.1	2.5
Washington	0.3	0.2	0.3	1.2	8.1	8.5	89.9	88.5	1.3	1.6
Wicomico	0.2	0.1	1.0	2.3	40.7	35.7	56.5	59.5	1.7	2.4
Worcester	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.7	36.8	25.8	61.7	71.6	1.2	1.7
STATE AVERAGE	0.4	0.4	1.8	4.6	39.8	37.2	53.6	52.4	4.4	5.4

Source: Maryland Special Education Census Data, Dec. 1 Child Count

MSIG Goal 2

MSIG Goal 2: Professional development will be designed and delivered on the basis of student performance data that demonstrate needs for building competencies and capacities to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 2-1

To integrate MSIG professional development with MSDE professional development guidelines and initiatives for standards-based reform.

Indicators 2-1

- **2.1.1** 100% of Maryland's neonatal care staff, hospital obstetric services staff, pediatricians, and family practitioners will receive information on identification, referral, and early intervention services.
- 2.1.2 100% of personnel serving infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families will participate in professional development activities related to supporting family priorities and providing early intervention services in natural environments.
- 2.1.3 100 % of special education teachers and related service personnel serving kindergarten-age students with disabilities will participate in professional development activities on the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment program.
- **2.1.4** 100% of professional development delivered to meet MSIG goals will fulfill the requirements described in *Strategic Directions for Professional Development in Maryland Public Schools.*

Objective 2-2

To Initiate informed and cohesive statewide participation in the implementation of the IDEA 1997 regulations, the Maryland SIG and its professional development initiatives, within the context of the Maryland School.

Indicators 2-2

- **2.2.1** Initial information on I DEA 1997 regulations and implementation of the MSIG will reach 100% of the leadership of partners and other participants.
- 2.2.2 100% of local administrators will become involved in advancing the goals and work of the MSIG with relation to their own districts.

Objective 2-3

To organize collaborative adoption, design, and delivery of sustained professional development programs to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities within the context of standards-based reform.

Indicators 2-3

- 2.3.1 100% of Maryland's professional development delivery systems and resources will be informed of the MSIG's professional development goals and initiatives.
- 2.3.2 100% of Maryland's professional development delivery system will be represented in the Professional Development Steering Group to improve education and outcomes for students with disabilities.
- **2.3.3** 100 % of Maryland's public schools will receive professional development promising practices information.
- **2.3.4** 100 % of LSS administrators/directors of special education will recommend and encourage participation in programs.

Objective 2-4

To respond in 1999 to immediate needs for professional development to improve education and outcomes for students with disabilities.

Indicators 2-4

- **2.4.1** 20 school districts will receive MSIG professional development awards for fall 2000 with 200 participants.
- **2.4.2** Practitioners and parents will participate in the new MSDE regional professional development on behavior management, discipline, alternative settings and environment in 2000.
- **2.4.3** Practitioners and parents will participate in the new MSDE regional professional development on behavioral assessments in 2000.
- **2.4.4** Practitioners and parents will participate in the new MSDE professional development on transition strategies in 2000.
- **2.4.5** Practitioners, personnel from community agencies that provide post-school supports, and parent resource center leaders will participate in professional development in interagency planning of post-school supports for students with disabilities in 1999.
- **2.4.6** Cadres of district-based trainers on effective practices for inclusion of LD students will be prepared in 100% of Maryland's districts during 2001.

Objective 2-5

To establish parameters for involving the spectrum of school personnel, parents, and others in professional development to build competencies and capacities for improving education for students with disabilities, 2000-2003.

Indicators 2-5

2.5.1 The 24 district-based trainer cadres will, in turn, provide professional development to approximately 4,800 practitioners and parents per year between 2000 and 2003.

MSIG Goal 2: Professional development will be designed and delivered on the basis of student performance data that demonstrate needs for building competencies and capacities to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 2-1

To integrate MSIG professional development with MSDE professional development guidelines and initiatives for standards-based reform.

Indicators 2-1

2.1.4 100% of professional development delivered to meet MSIG goals will fulfill the requirements described in *Strategic Directions for Professional Development in Maryland Public Schools.*

2002 REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES*

STATE NETWORK	DESCRIPTION***	PROJECTED NUMBER OF EDUCATORS**	FUNDI NG AMOUNT
Baltimore City	The network program consists of the Technology Leaders in the Classroom initiative, which utilizes a training of trainers model to certify school technology teams. Members of the teams develop lesson plans and classroom activities that are available to all Baltimore City Public School personnel via the web. Also team members train, coach, and mentor the staff in their home schools. As a result of teacher training and curricula infusion, coupled with project-based classrooms and distance learning, 75% of students in selected schools will be computer literate.	376	\$102,000
Eastern Shore	The network program represents a collaborative staff development initiative with three main focus areas: Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP), High School Assessments (HSA), and Aspiring Leaders. At the network level, school systems send prospective administrator candidates, the Aspiring Leaders, to a series of yearlong training sessions for the purpose of creating a pool of administrator candidates versed in effective school leadership. MSPAP and HSA are addressed at the local school system level with a variety of ongoing staff development events designed ultimately to improve student performance on MSPAP and to prepare high school students for the successful completion of the content assessments.	2061	\$221,000
North Central	The network supports efforts to improve the quality of instruction in local schools to increase achievement for all students. The network provides training and collaborative follow-up to a cadre of teachers who train fellow teachers to focus on improving achievement on all state assessments, including ensuring success for students on the Maryland High School Assessments.	4362	\$155,000
Prince George's	The network implements professional development to support the Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP) and the High School Improvement Program through teacher research models of action research and inquiry group methodology. Teacher research projects focus on reading instruction and improving achievement.	2623	\$135,000
Southern Maryland	The network focuses on improving student performance with the Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP) and the High School Improvement Program. It extends the system wide literacy program that supports continuous improvement of K-8 instruction for all students in the area of reading/language arts and as a result increases student achievement.	597	\$100,000
West Central	The network supports the implementation of continuous standards-based staff development programs that result in the improvement of instruction and higher achievement for students. The main focus is the High School Improvement Program and Reading Strategies /Action Research, targeting reading and writing in the content areas. The audience is secondary teachers in content areas, which are part of the High School Assessments, including special educators and ESOL teachers, as well as school based administrators and central office personnel.	596	\$150,000
Western Maryland	The network cooperatively implements professional development to support the Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP) and the High School Improvement Program by sharing common goals. The Network focuses on improving student performance on the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) and the High School Assessments. Additionally, the network supports school and system improvement plans focused on improving teaching, learning, and school management including teacher leaders aspiring to administrative positions.	1428	\$215,000
Western Shore	In response to the need for increasing the skills and abilities of administrators the network is creating a leadership academy for principals, aspiring principals, and teacher leaders. Academic focus is on intellectual development, school improvement, collaborative support, and continuous improvement. A partnership with Western Maryland College has been established to provide certification in administration. This program applies research strategies and best practices to the professional development of leadership based on the belief that the outcome will result in positive student achievement.	200	\$139,000
TOTAL		12,243	\$1,217,000

^{*} See Appendix C for CSPD activities and specifications by district.

^{**} Includes teachers (regular and special education), administrators and other educators that support classroom instruction and student learning.

^{***} All programs provide intensive staff development with multiple learning opportunities and follow-up throughout the school year.

MSIG Goal 3

MSIG Goal 3: Preservice programs will increase their productivity and capacities to align personnel preparation with standards-based reform and with professional development to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 3-1

To integrate MSIG preservice preparation alignment activities with MSDE initiatives for teacher education redesign.

Indicator 3-1

- 3.1.1 100% of faculty and leadership engaged in preservice education of personnel who serve infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families will receive principles and guidelines for family-centered, community-based early intervention service delivery.
- 3.1.2 100% of faculty engaged in preservice education of early childhood special and general education personnel will receive training on the implementation of the work sampling system for the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment program.
- **3.1.3** 100% of graduating LHE students in early childhood special and general education programs will receive training on the implementation of the work sampling system for the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment program.
- **3.1.4** 100% of faculty and leadership involved in preservice education in general education, special education, and related services will receive the principles and guidelines on redesigning preservice preparation.

Objective 3-2

To improve preservice capacities for preparing personnel who are competent to improve education and outcomes for students with disabilities, in alignment with standards-based reform and a professional development continuum.

Indicators 3-2

- **3.2.1** By November 2000, 100% of Maryland's current PDSs will have District-I HE Teams for planning preservice alignment and articulation between two-year and four-year institutions.
- 3.2.2 By 2003, District-I HE Teams for planning preservice alignment and articulation will exist in at least 50 PDSs that involve all school districts and all preservice programs in special education, general education, related services, and school administration.
- 3.2.3 Measurable improvements related to standards-based education of children with disabilities will occur in all of Maryland's preservice preparation programs each year from 2000 to 2003.

Objective 3-3

To assist preservice programs in general and special education in meeting new requirements in reading theory and methodology for initial certification or re-certification (and in other program changes that evolve through alignment with standards-based reform).

Objective 3-4

To reduce the number of personnel who are providing instruction to students with disabilities without full qualifications to do so.

Indicator 3-4

- **3.4.1** Between 1999 and 2003, approximately 150 practitioners will receive full certification as a result of training for delivery of instruction to students with autism.
- **3.4.2** Between 1999 and 2002, approximately 80 practitioners will receive full certification as a result of training for delivery of instruction to students with visual disabilities.
- **3.4.3** Stipend/scholarship support for practitioners in training for full certification in critical areas will be available to all 24 LEAs.
- **3.4.4** Additional practitioners, as identified, will receive full certification as a result of LSS-IHE training partnerships between 2000 and 2003, through projects generated by MSIG-supported RFPs.

Objective 3-5

To increase the supply of new personnel who are qualified to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Indicators 3-5

3.5.1 The numbers of special education trainees who are new personnel in the teacher education pipeline will increase by 20% between 2000 and 2003.

MSIG Goal 3: Preservice programs will increase their productivity and capacities to align personnel preparation with standards-based reform and with professional development to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 3-2

To improve preservice capacities for preparing personnel who are competent to improve education and outcomes for students with disabilities, in alignment with standards-based reform and a professional development continuum.

Indicators 3-2

- **3.2.1** By November 2000, 100% of Maryland's current PDSs will have District-I HE Teams for planning preservice alignment and articulation between two-year and four-year institutions.
- 3.2.2 By 2003, District-IHE Teams for planning preservice alignment and articulation will exist in at least 50 PDSs that involve all school districts and all preservice programs in special education, general education, related services, and school administration.
- 3.2.3 Measurable improvements related to standards-based education of children with disabilities will occur in all of Maryland's preservice preparation programs each year from 2000 to 2003.

MARYLAND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (IHE) PARTNERSHIPS (3.2)

IHE	AGREEMENT	LSSs	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
Bowie State	Yes	Prince George's	Mentoring	50,000
University				25,000
College of Notre	Yes	Harford	Reading Courses	50,000
Dame of Maryland			Mentoring	25,000
Coppin State	Yes	Baltimore City	Assessment Training	50,000
University			Mentoring	25,000
Frostburg State	Yes	Allegany	Mentoring	50,000
College		Garrett	Learning strategy training	25,000
Goucher College	Yes	Anne Arundel	Mentoring	50,000
			Assessment training	25,000
Hood College	Yes	Washington	Mentoring	50,000
		Garrett	Learning strategy training	25,000
Johns Hopkins	Yes	Howard	Mentoring ECI/SE teachers	50,000
Univ.				25,000
Loyola College	Yes	Baltimore	Redesigning ECI/SE program	50,000
		Howard	Mentoring Teachers	25,000
			PDS development	
Mount St. Mary's	Yes	Frederick	Mentoring Developing blanded SE/Flow Brogram	50,000
College			Developing blended SE/Elem. Program	25,000
Towson University	Yes	Howard	Mentoring DDC days large at	50,000
		Baltimore County	PDS development	25,000
University of	Yes	Prince George's	Mentoring	50,000
Maryland - College			PDS development	25,000
Park				
University of	Yes	Kent	Mentoring	50,000
Maryland-Eastern		Dorchester	MSPAP Analysis	25,000
Shore		Caroline		
Western Maryland	Yes	Carroll	General education intervention	Carryover Year 2
College			strategies	Funds

LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM GRANTS

Local School System	Submitted	Approved	Grant Topic Area(s)
Allegany	11/07/01	11/13/01	General Education accommodations
Anne Arundel	01/08/02	01/15/02	MSPAP Strategies
Baltimore City		10/15/01	LRE I nservices
Calvert	1/29/02	1/29/02	Training on IEP development and access to general education
Caroline	1/27/02	1/29/02	Inclusion; Reading and Math
Carroll	8/10/01	9/24/01	Reading Instruction
Cecil	9/05/01	9/24/01	FBA and BIP
Charles	8/30/01	10/01/01	Inclusion
Dorchester	8/27/01	9/24/01	Accommodations in General Education and Special Education;
			Instructional Strategies
Frederick	8/30/01	9/28/01	MSPAP Strategies; Criterion Referenced Testing Strategies
Garrett	9/10/01	9/28/01	Inclusion of SED students
Harford	8/17/01	9/28/01	Reading Interventions
Howard	9/10/01	10/22/01	New teacher mentoring
Kent	11/13/01	11/14/01	Differentiated Instructional Strategies
Montgomery	8/20/01	9/28/01	Inclusion
Prince George's	11/04/01	11/28/01	Accommodations for Middle School Students
Queen Anne's	9/05/01	9/28/01	Academy of Reading Autoskills Program
St. Mary's	2/07/02	2/11/02	Inclusion
Washington	8/31/01	9/24/01	Paraprofessional Training
Wicomico	10/14/01	10/22/01	Inclusion Model
Worcester	8/29/01	9/24/01	MSPAP Analysis
Maryland School for the Deaf	8/31/01	9/24/01	Reading Comprehension Strategies

LSS Grants Pending as of February 11, 2002; Baltimore, Somerset, Talbot Counties and Maryland School for the Blind

MSIG Goal 3: Preservice programs will increase their productivity and capacities to align personnel preparation with standards-based reform and with professional development to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 3-5

To increase the supply of new personnel who are qualified to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Indicators 3-5

3.5.1 The numbers of special education trainees who are new personnel in the teacher education pipeline will increase by 20% between 2000 and 2003.

Computation Methodology

I dentify Maryland teachers and therapists that have and do not have certifications.

SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND THERAPISTS WITH AND WITHOUT CERTIFICATES (3.5.1)

		Special Education Teachers		Therapists	
Local School System	Students with Disabilities	Certified	Non-Certified	Certified	Non-Certified
	(Dec. 1, 2001)	2001	2001	2001	2001
Allegany County	1,892	82	4	24	3
Anne Arundel County	10,448	641	19	109	9
Baltimore City	16,160	1,242	131	125	36
Baltimore County	13,313	835	69	191	70
Calvert County	2,183	137	6	21	11
Caroline County	714	44	1	5	0
Carroll County	3,732	164	11	57	21
Cecil County	2,606	174	6	16	1
Charles County	2,577	177	20	22	6
Dorchester County	642	38	4	4	1
Frederick County	4,537	235	1	46	9
Garrett County	743	36	0	6	0
Harford County	5,803	292	10	31	21
Howard County	4,830	424	26	84	44
Kent County	336	16	0	4	0
Montgomery County	16,471	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Prince George's County	14,853	1,012	105	167	142
Queen Anne's County	1,026	51	1	6	1
Saint Mary's County	2,121	149	0	18	7
Somerset County	375	26	1	1	2
Talbot County	474	28	1	4	2
Washington County	2,925	134	8	17	3
Wicomico County	1,679	127	0	9	4
Worcester County	888	58	1	6	1

Source: MSDE, Division of Planning, Results, and Information Management

N/A - Data not available at time of publication

MSIG Goal 4

MSIG Goal 4: The statewide early intervention system will improve its capacities to provide high-quality services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, and to promote readiness to learn.

Objective 4-1

To organize a permanent Steering Group to guide activities and inform all stakeholders on plans for statewide outreach and evaluation activities to improve early intervention capacities.

Indicators 4-1

4.1.1 100% of partners and stakeholders in Maryland's early intervention system will receive information on plans for the comprehensive evaluation and their participatory involvement by April 99.

Objective 4-2

To improve current efforts to identify all Maryland infants and toddlers who are potentially eligible to receive early intervention services under Part C of I DEA and inform families about available services.

- **4.2.1** Report % of total State population of children birth to three years referred annually.
- **4.2.2** Report % of total State population of children birth to three years served annually.
- **4.2.3** % of children from birth to two years of age referred or recommended by physicians and hospitals will increase annually.
- 4.2.4 % of children birth to three years of age referred from Asian and Hispanic populations will increase to be proportionately representative of the statewide Asian and Hispanic populations of infants and toddlers.
- 4.2.5 % of children and families from Asian and Hispanic populations will increase to be proportionately representative of the statewide Asian and Hispanic populations of infants and toddlers.

Objective 4-3

To provide families of eligible infants and toddlers with service delivery options that address the identified needs of their children and support family priorities.

Indicators 4-3

- **4.3.1** % of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services in childcare environments, including Judy Centers, will increase annually.
- **4.3.2** % of children who are withdrawn from the early intervention system by parents prior to attaining desired outcomes will decrease annually.

Objective 4-4

To improve transition of children and families from early intervention to preschool and other community-based services.

- **4.4.1** The number of toddlers exiting early intervention services at age three who transition to community-based services will increase, whether or not they are eligible for preschool special education.
- **4.4.2** % of families indicating satisfaction with their children's transition from the early intervention system at age three will increase.
- **4.4.3** 10% of toddlers exiting the early intervention system at age three will participate in a pilot phase of MSDE's Early Childhood Assessment Program that provides a work sampling system for preschool services.

MSIG Goal 4: The statewide early intervention system will improve its capacities to provide high-quality services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, and to promote readiness to learn.

Objective 4-2

To improve current efforts to identify all Maryland infants and toddlers who are potentially eligible to receive early intervention services under Part C of I DEA and inform families about available services.

- **4.2.1** Report % of total State population of children birth to three years referred annually.
- **4.2.2** Report % of total State population of children birth to three years served annually.
- **4.2.3** % of children from birth to two years of age referred or recommended by physicians and hospitals will increase annually.
- 4.2.4 % of children birth to three years of age referred from Asian and Hispanic populations will increase to be proportionately representative of the statewide Asian and Hispanic populations of infants and toddlers.
- 4.2.5 % of children and families from Asian and Hispanic populations will increase to be proportionately representative of the statewide Asian and Hispanic populations of infants and toddlers.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Percentage of Age 0-3 Population Referred (4.2.1)

LSS	1998-2000 Total Births	12/1/2001 Referrals	Percentage Referred
Allegany	2,275	125	5.49%
Anne Arundel	20,052	774	3.86%
Baltimore City	28,999	1,167	4.02%
Baltimore County	27,479	1,658	6.03%
Calvert	2,919	91	3.12%
Caroline	1,106	60	5.42%
Carroll	5,647	252	4.46%
Cecil	3,398	107	3.15%
Charles	5,110	114	2.23%
Dorchester	940	47	5.00%
Frederick	8,231	328	3.98%
Garrett	1,046	47	4.49%
Harford	8,961	470	5.24%
Howard	10,297	607	5.89%
Kent	595	24	4.03%
Montgomery	37,675	1,415	3.76%
Prince George's	36,461	827	2.27%
Queen Anne's	1,454	70	4.81%
St. Mary's	774	15	1.94%
Somerset	3,736	120	3.21%
Talbot	1,023	47	4.59%
Washington	4,824	199	4.13%
Wicomico	3,337	139	4.17%
Worcester	1,511	43	2.85%
State Totals*	217,850	8,746	4.01%

 $^{^{\}star}$ Based on the annual count of children served in a 12 month period

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Percentage of Age 0-3 Population Served (4.2.2)

LSS	1998-2000 Total Births	12/1/2001 Annual Count	Percentage Served
Allegany	2,275	134	5.89%
Anne Arundel	20,052	850	4.24%
Baltimore City	28,999	1,324	4.57%
Baltimore County	27,479	1,131	4.12%
Calvert	2,919	81	2.77%
Caroline	1,106	43	3.89%
Carroll	5,647	207	3.67%
Cecil	3,398	94	2.77%
Charles	5,110	123	2.41%
Dorchester	940	68	7.23%
Frederick	8,231	368	4.47%
Garrett	1,046	27	2.58%
Harford	8,961	517	5.77%
Howard	10,297	469	4.55%
Kent	595	8	1.34%
Montgomery	37,675	1,480	3.93%
Prince George's	36,461	951	2.61%
Queen Anne's	1,454	42	2.89%
St. Mary's	774	13	1.68%
Somerset	3,736	127	3.40%
Talbot	1,023	27	2.64%
Washington	4,824	185	3.83%
Wicomico	3,337	147	4.41%
Worcester	1,511	31	2.05%
State Totals*	217,850	8,447	3.88%

^{*} Based on the annual count of children served in a 12 month period

Children from Birth to Age Two by Referral Source (4.2.3)

	12/1/2	2000	12/1/	2001
Referral Source	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Hospital	1,120	27.0%	1,093	26.3%
Physician	272	6.5%	294	7.1%
Total	1,392	33.5%	1,387	33.4%

Total Referrals	
12/99-12/00	
Birth to Age Two	4,153

Total Referrals	
12/00-12/01	
Birth to Age Two	4,152

Children from Birth to Age Two by Referral Recommendation (4.2.3)

	12/1/2000		12/1/	2001
Referral Recommendation	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Hospital	720	17.3%	710	17.1%
Physician	949	22.9%	1,103	26.6%
Total	1,669	40.2%	1,813	43.7%

Total Referrals	
12/99-12/00	
Birth to Age Two	4,153

Total Referrals	
12/00-12/01	
Birth to Age Two	4,152

Percentage of Children Referred from Asian and Hispanic Populations (4.2.4)

Population	Percentage of Births - 2000	Percentage Referred - 2000	Percentage Referred - 2001
Asian	4.9%	1.7%	2.3%
Hispanic	6.6%	3.2%	4.3%

Percentage of Children Served from Asian and Hispanic Populations (4.2.5)

Population	Percentage of Births - 2000	Percentage Served - 2000	Percentage Served - 2001
Asian	4.9%	2.1%	2.2%
Hispanic	6.6%	3.7%	4.0%

MSIG Goal 4: The statewide early intervention system will improve its capacities to provide high-quality services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, and to promote readiness to learn.

Objective 4-3

To provide families of eligible infants and toddlers with service delivery options that address the identified needs of their children and support family priorities.

- **4.3.1** % of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services in childcare environments, including Judy Centers, will increase annually.
- **4.3.2** % of children who are withdrawn from the early intervention system by parents prior to attaining desired outcomes will decrease annually.

Percentage of Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services in Child Care Environments (4.3.1)

	12/1/2000		12/1/	'2001
Population	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Family Day Care	207	2.6%	183	2.2%
Child Care Center	209	2.6%	278	3.3%
Family/Center	23	0.3%	26	0.3%
Judy Center	*		*	
Total	439	5.6%	487	5.8%

Total Served	
12/99-12/00	7,894

Percentage of Children Withdrawn from the Early Intervention System by Parents Prior to Attaining the Desired Outcomes (4.3.2)

	12/1/2000	12/1/2001
Total Exiting	3,623	4,070
Number of Parent Withdrawals	508	557
Percentage of Parent Withdrawals	14%	14%

Total Served 12/00-12/01 8,447

^{*} Data not currently available

MSIG Goal 4: The statewide early intervention system will improve its capacities to provide high-quality services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, and to promote readiness to learn.

Objective 4-4

To improve transition of children and families from early intervention to preschool and other community-based services.

- **4.4.1** The number of toddlers exiting early intervention services at age three who transition to community-based services will increase, whether or not they are eligible for preschool special education.
- **4.4.2** % of families indicating satisfaction with their children's transition from the early intervention system at age three will increase.
- **4.4.3** 10% of toddlers exiting the early intervention system at age three will participate in a pilot phase of MSDE's Early Childhood Assessment Program that provides a work sampling system for preschool services.

Number of Toddlers Exiting Early Intervention Services at Age Three who Transition to Community-Based Services (4.4.1)

	12/1/2000		
Eligibility	Total # Transitioning	Transition W/Referrals	Percentage
Eligible for Preschool Special Education	1,745	723	41.4%
Not Eligible for Preschool Special Education	560	141	25.2%
Total	2,305	864	37.5%

	12/1/2001		
Eligibility	Total # Transitioning	Transition W/Referrals	Percentage
Eligible for Preschool Special Education	2,022	740	36.6%
Not Eligible for Preschool Special Education	576	126	21.9%
Total	2,598	866	33.3%

MSIG Goal 5

MSIG Goal: Capacities for improving instruction and outcomes for students with disabilities will be strengthened throughout Maryland's education community as a result of technical assistance for improvement of education and management of change.

Objective 5-1

To adopt and communicate a model for delivery of technical assistance.

Objective 5-2

To provide information and technical assistance to promote the adoption and implementation of research and effective practices for improving education and outcomes for students with disabilities.

Indicators 5-2

- **5.2.1** By 2003, 50% of school districts will adopt and implement new effective practices and research findings as a basis for improving education and outcomes for students with disabilities.
- **5.2.2** By 2003, 100% of professional development delivery systems and sources will adopt and implement new effective practices and research findings as a basis for improving professional development in education for students with disabilities.
- **5.2.3** By 2003, 50% of preservice programs will adopt and implement new effective practices and research findings as a basis for improving personnel preparation in education for students with disabilities.
- **5.2.4** By 2003, 50% of the Partners for Success centers will adopt and implement new effective practices and research findings as a basis for improving parent-educator skills and knowledge.

Objective 5-3

To organize a broad-based Consumer Review Group for quality control and continuous feedback of information needs.

Objective 5-4

To convene annual conferences to advance stakeholder participation in using research and effective practice for improving education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 5-5

To provide needs-based assistance to all Maryland school districts for improving education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Indicators 5-5

- **5.5.1** Across districts, the overall performance of students with disabilities on MSPAP measures will improve by 3% per year from the 1997-1998 baseline to 2002-2003.
- **5.5.2** Among Maryland's low-performing schools, the overall performance of students with disabilities will improve on all outcome measures will improve by 3% per year from the 1997-1998 baseline to 2002-2003.
- **5.5.3** At least 10 successful local practitioners will become part of school improvement cadres each year between 1999 and 2003, for a total of at least 50 practitioner-consultants by 2003.

Objective 5-6

To provide assistance with reviews of State and local policies that influence education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Indicators 5-6

5.6.1 Review of all MSDE policies and procedures relating to education of students with disabilities, with modifications as appropriate.

Objective 5-7

To secure and leverage additional resources that will complement the work of the State Improvement Grant.

- **5.7.1** At least 15 grant applications for projects that complement and extend MSIG activities will be submitted to public and private agencies between 1999 and 2003.
- **5.7.2** Grants to LSSs will leverage approximately \$1.5 million per year in local discretionary projects designed to address standards-based reform of education and better results for students with disabilities.
- **5.7.3** MSIG activities in cooperation with parallel or complementary projects and programs of the MSDE will add a value of at least \$50,000 per year to the MSIG resources from 1999 to 2003.

Appendix A

Elaboration of Local School System Exemptions from Maryland State Performance Assessment Program

Allegany County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8 $\,$

Grade 3														
Content	Read	Reading Writing		ting	Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	730	731	730	731	730	731	730	731	730	731	730	731		
Exempt	95	89	0	0	83	88	22	0	0	0	0	0		
% Exempt	13.0%	12.2%	0.0%	0.0%	11.4%	12.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.57%	4.04%

Grade 5														
Content	Reading Writing		ting	Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %		
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	775	782	775	782	775	782	775	782	775	782	775	782		
Exempt	114	105	*	*	78	85	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	14.7%	13.4%	0.3%	0.1%	10.1%	10.9%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	4.30%	4.13%

Grade 8														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Average %	
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	790	769	790	769	790	769	790	790	790	769	790	769		
Exempt	43	56	0	0	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0		
% Exempt	5.5%	7.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.18%	1.34%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Anne Arundel County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	Reading		ting	Language Usage		Mathematics		Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Average %	
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	5755	5705	5755	5705	5755	5705	5755	5705	5755	5705	5755	5705		
Exempt	450	393	47	36	423	410	200	36	47	36	47	36		
% Exempt	7.8%	6.9%	0.8%	0.6%	7.3%	7.2%	3.5%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	3.50%	2.77%

Grade 5														
Content	Rea	ding	Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	6068	6254	6068	6254	6068	6254	6068	6254	6068	6254	6068	6254		
Exempt	572	586	38	21	547	512	38	21	38	21	38	21		
% Exempt	9.4%	9.4%	0.6%	0.3%	9.0%	8.2%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	3.49%	3.15%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	g Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	5732	5858	5732	5858	5732	5858	5732	5858	5732	5858	5732	5858		
Exempt	273	339	65	51	187	269	65	51	65	51	65	51		
% Exempt	4.8%	5.8%	1.1%	0.9%	3.3%	4.6%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%	0.9%	2.09%	2.31%

Baltimore City 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	ige %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	8311	7755	8311	7755	8311	7755	8311	7755	8311	7755	8311	7755		
Exempt	533	500	97	87	252	261	324	87	97	87	97	87		
% Exempt	6.4%	6.4%	1.2%	1.1%	3.0%	3.4%	3.9%	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%	2.81%	2.38%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	ige %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	7647	6950	7647	6950	7647	6950	7647	6950	7647	6950	7647	6950		
Exempt	675	566	86	88	273	238	86	88	86	88	86	88		
% Exempt	8.9%	8.1%	1.1%	1.3%	3.6%	3.4%	1.1%	1.3%	1.1%	1.3%	1.1%	1.3%	2.82%	2.77%

Grade 8														
Content	Rea	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	6729	6973	6729	6973	6729	6973	6729	6973	6729	6973	6729	6973		
Exempt	211	269	61	87	177	211	61	87	61	87	61	87		
% Exempt	3.1%	3.9%	0.9%	1.2%	2.6%	3.0%	0.9%	1.2%	0.9%	1.2%	0.9%	1.2%	1.57%	1.98%

Baltimore County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8 $\,$

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	ige %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	8355	8212	8355	8212	8355	8212	8355	8212	8355	8212	8355	8212		
Exempt	415	471	60	46	158	475	81	46	60	46	60	46		
% Exempt	4.9%	5.7%	0.7%	0.6%	1.9%	5.8%	1.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	1.66%	2.29%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	8463	8548	8463	8548	8463	8548	8463	8548	8463	8548	8463	8548		
Exempt	456	562	73	67	230	583	73	67	73	67	73	67		
% Exempt	5.3%	6.6%	0.9%	0.8%	2.7%	6.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	1.93%	2.76%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	8077	8289	8077	8289	8077	8289	8077	8289	8077	8289	8077	8289		
Exempt	306	235	75	43	271	269	75	43	75	43	75	43		
% Exempt	3.7%	2.8%	0.9%	0.5%	3.3%	3.2%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	1.81%	1.36%

Calvert County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8 $\,$

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	nce	Social S	Studies	Avera	ıge %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1241	1236	1241	1236	1241	1236	1241	1236	1241	1236	1241	1236		
Exempt	65	53	*	*	35	28	7	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	5.2%	4.3%	0.2%	0.3%	2.8%	2.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	1.56%	1.31%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1309	1284	1309	1284	1309	1284	1309	1284	1309	1284	1309	1284		
Exempt	89	62	*	5	24	23	*	5	*	5	*	5		
% Exempt	6.8%	4.8%	0.2%	0.4%	1.8%	1.8%	.02%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	1.54%	1.36%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	ige %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1164	1318	1164	1318	1164	1318	1164	1318	1164	1318	1164	1318		
Exempt	32	31	0	*	15	26	0	*	0	*	0	*		
% Exempt	2.7%	2.4%	0.0%	0.3%	1.3%	2.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.67%	0.92%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Caroline County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social :	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	442	421	442	421	442	421	442	421	442	421	442	421		
Exempt	47	38	*	*	39	34	11	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	10.6%	9.0%	0.7%	1.0%	8.8%	8.1%	2.5%	1.0%	0.7%	1.0%	0.7%	1.0%	4.00%	3.48%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	452	454	452	454	452	454	452	454	452	454	452	454		
Exempt	49	34	*	*	41	32	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	10.8%	7.5%	0.7%	0.4%	9.1%	7.0%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	3.76%	2.72%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	395	409	395	409	395	409	395	409	395	409	395	409		
Exempt	*	31	0	*	5	16	0	*	0	*	0	*		
% Exempt	1.0%	7.6%	0.0%	0.7%	1.3%	3.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.38%	2.40%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Carroll County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8 $\,$

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Aver	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	2173	2150	2173	2150	2173	2150	2173	2150	2173	2150	2173	2150		
Exempt	142	139	11	12	154	147	25	12	11	12	11	12		
% Exempt	6.5%	6.5%	0.5%	0.6%	7.1%	6.8%	1.2%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	2.72%	2.59%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Aver	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	2296	2233	2296	2233	2296	2233	2296	2233	2296	2233	2296	2233		
Exempt	128	160	11	13	181	175	11	13	11	13	11	13		
% Exempt	5.6%	7.2%	0.5%	0.6%	7.9%	7.8%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	2.56%	2.89%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Aver	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	2120	2154	2120	2154	2120	2154	2120	2154	2120	2154	2120	2154		
Exempt	41	36	18	11	77	45	18	11	18	11	18	11		
% Exempt	1.9%	1.7%	0.8%	0.5%	3.6%	2.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.8%	0.5%	0.8%	0.5%	1.49%	0.97%

Cecil County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8 $\,$

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Aver	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1282	1240	1282	1240	1282	1240	1282	1240	1282	1240	1282	1240		
Exempt	162	120	9	*	142	114	19	*	9	*	9	*		
% Exempt	12.7%	9.7%	0.7%	0.2%	11.1%	9.2%	1.5%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	3.61%	3.31%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	nce	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1272	1323	1272	1323	1272	1323	1272	1323	1272	1323	1272	1323		
Exempt	169	160	13	22	152	137	13	22	13	22	13	22		
% Exempt	13.3%	12.1%	1.0%	1.7%	11.9%	10.4%	1.0%	1.7%	1.0%	1.7%	1.0%	1.7%	4.89%	4.85%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1153	1275	1153	1275	1153	1275	1153	1275	1153	1275	1153	1275		
Exempt	41	53	13	12	34	36	13	12	13	12	13	12		
% Exempt	3.6%	4.2%	1.1%	0.9%	3.0%	2.8%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%	0.9%	1.84%	1.79%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Charles County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8 $\,$

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Aver	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1757	1682	1757	1682	1757	1682	1757	1682	1757	1682	1757	1682		
Exempt	83	94	13	15	63	90	28	15	13	15	13	15		
% Exempt	4.7%	5.6%	0.7%	0.9%	3.6%	5.4%	1.6%	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	2.02%	2.42%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	nce	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1756	1824	1756	1824	1756	1824	1756	1824	1756	1824	1756	1824		
Exempt	128	157	6	17	82	103	6	17	6	17	6	17		
% Exempt	7.3%	8.6%	0.3%	0.9%	4.7%	5.6%	0.3%	0.9%	0.3%	0.9%	0.3%	0.9%	2.22%	3.00%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1839	1778	1839	1778	1839	1778	1839	1778	1839	1778	1839	1778		
Exempt	138	138	20	18	72	87	20	17	20	18	20	18		
% Exempt	7.5%	7.8%	1.1%	1.0%	3.9%	4.9%	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%	2.63%	2.78%

Dorchester County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8 $\,$

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	354	348	354	348	354	348	354	348	354	348	354	348		
Exempt	20	29	5	8	35	28	21	8	5	8	5	8		
% Exempt	5.6%	8.3%	1.4%	2.3%	9.9%	8.0%	5.9%	2.3%	1.4%	2.3%	1.4%	2.3%	4.28%	4.26%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	417	429	417	429	417	429	417	429	417	429	417	429		
Exempt	47	44	7	*	38	48	7	*	7	*	7	*		
% Exempt	11.3%	10.3%	1.7%	0.9%	9.1%	11.2%	1.7%	0.9%	1.7%	0.9%	1.7%	0.9%	4.52%	4.20%

Grade 8														
Content	Rea	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	369	359	369	359	369	359	369	359	369	359	369	359		
Exempt	23	28	8	*	24	15	8	*	8	*	8	*		
% Exempt	6.2%	7.8%	2.2%	1.1%	6.5%	4.2%	2.2%	1.1%	2.2%	1.1%	2.2%	1.1%	3.57%	2.74%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Frederick County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Aver	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	2838	2920	2838	2920	2838	2920	2838	2920	2838	2920	2838	2920		
Exempt	154	139	12	19	125	131	21	19	12	19	12	19		
% Exempt	5.4%	4.8%	0.4%	0.7%	4.4%	4.5%	0.7%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	1.97%	1.97%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	2817	3087	2817	3087	2817	3087	2817	3087	2817	3087	2817	3087		
Exempt	133	163	12	16	131	151	12	16	12	16	12	16		
% Exempt	4.7%	5.3%	0.4%	0.5%	4.7%	4.9%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	1.85%	2.04%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	2725	2877	2725	2877	2725	2877	2725	2877	2725	2877	2725	2877		
Exempt	60	61	7	15	52	83	7	15	7	15	7	15		
% Exempt	2.2%	2.1%	0.3%	0.5%	1.9%	2.9%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.5%	0.86%	1.18%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Garrett County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8 $\,$

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	412	370	412	370	412	370	412	370	412	370	412	370		
Exempt	43	35	*	*	25	16	7	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	10.4%	9.5%	0.5%	1.1%	6.1%	4.3%	1.7%	1.1%	0.5%	1.1%	0.5%	1.1%	3.28%	3.02%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	379	412	379	412	379	412	379	412	379	412	379	412		
Exempt	54	50	*	*	24	21	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	14.2%	12.1%	0.8%	0.7%	6.3%	5.1%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	3.96%	3.36%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	351	367	351	367	351	367	351	367	351	367	351	367		
Exempt	34	31	*	*	7	15	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	9.7%	8.4%	0.3%	0.3%	2.0%	4.1%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	2.14%	2.27%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Harford County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	3038	3102	3038	3102	3038	3102	3038	3102	3038	3102	3038	3102		
Exempt	224	212	7	10	220	212	53	10	7	10	7	10		
% Exempt	7.4%	6.8%	0.2%	0.3%	7.2%	6.8%	1.7%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	2.84%	2.49%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	3165	3302	3165	3302	3165	3302	3165	3302	3165	3302	3165	3302		
Exempt	211	244	9	10	229	291	9	10	9	10	9	10		
% Exempt	6.7%	7.4%	0.3%	0.3%	7.2%	8.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	2.51%	2.90%

Grade 8			•									•		
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	3030	3018	3030	3018	3030	3018	3030	3018	3030	3018	3030	3018		
Exempt	73	85	19	14	43	83	19	14	19	14	19	14		
% Exempt	2.4%	2.8%	0.6%	0.5%	1.4%	2.8%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	1.06%	1.24%

Howard County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	3595	3618	3595	3618	3595	3618	3595	3618	3595	3618	3595	3618		
Exempt	140	123	21	29	129	95	52	29	21	29	21	29		
% Exempt	3.9%	3.4%	0.6%	0.8%	3.6%	2.6%	1.4%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	1.78%	1.54%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	3500	3725	3500	3725	3500	3725	3500	3725	3500	3725	3500	3725		
Exempt	167	152	26	25	133	138	26	25	26	25	26	25		
% Exempt	4.8%	4.1%	0.7%	0.7%	3.8%	3.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	1.92%	1.74%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	3316	3498	3316	3498	3316	3498	3316	3498	3316	3498	3316	3498		
Exempt	64	105	26	24	80	98	26	24	26	24	26	24		
% Exempt	1.9%	3.0%	0.8%	0.7%	2.4%	2.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	1.25%	1.42%

Kent County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8 $\,$

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	216	207	216	207	216	207	216	207	216	207	216	207		
Exempt	17	18	*	*	20	15	5	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	7.9%	8.7%	1.9%	1.4%	9.3%	7.2%	2.3%	1.4%	1.9%	1.4%	1.9%	1.4%	4.17%	3.62%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	223	224	223	224	223	224	223	224	223	224	223	224		i
Exempt	19	21	*	*	*	5	*	*	*	*	*	*		ı
% Exempt	8.5%	9.4%	0.9%	0.4%	1.8%	2.2%	0.9%	0.4%	0.9%	0.4%	0.9%	0.4%	2.32%	2.23%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	207	212	207	212	207	212	207	212	207	212	207	212		
Exempt	11	12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	5.3%	5.7%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	1.29%	1.42%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Montgomery County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8 $\,$

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Language	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	nce	Social :	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	10326	10545	10326	10545	10326	10545	10326	10545	10326	10545	10326	10545		
Exempt	719	671	70	54	794	692	506	54	70	54	70	54		
% Exempt	6.9%	6.4%	0.7%	0.5%	7.7%	6.6%	4.9%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%	3.60%	2.50%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	10478	10892	10478	10892	10478	10892	10478	10892	10478	10892	10478	10892		
Exempt	876	820	58	52	1144	923	58	52	58	52	58	52		
% Exempt	8.3%	7.5%	0.6%	0.5%	10.9%	8.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	3.58%	2.99%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ling	Wri	ting	Languag	je Usage	Mathe	ematics	Sci	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	9677	10215	9677	10215	9677	10215	9677	10215	9677	10215	9677	10215		
Exempt	446	431	85	66	610	687	85	66	85	66	85	66		
% Exempt	4.6%	4.2%	0.9%	0.6%	6.2%	6.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%	0.6%	2.40%	2.25%

Prince George's County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Rea	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	10776	10797	10776	10797	10776	10797	10776	10797	10776	10797	10776	10797		
Exempt	622	688	16	14	560	587	483	14	16	14	16	14		
% Exempt	5.7%	6.4%	0.1%	0.1%	5.2%	5.4%	4.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	2.65%	2.05%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	10554	10921	10554	10921	10554	10921	10554	10921	10554	10921	10554	10921		
Exempt	906	884	7	13	748	693	7	13	7	13	7	13		
% Exempt	8.6%	8.1%	0.1%	0.1%	7.1%	6.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	2.66%	2.49%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	je Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	nce	Social	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	9342	9795	9342	9795	9342	9795	9342	9795	9342	9795	9342	9795		
Exempt	396	503	13	13	231	199	13	13	13	13	13	13		
% Exempt	4.2%	5.1%	0.1%	0.1%	2.5%	2.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	1.21%	1.28%

Queen Anne's County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	545	549	545	549	545	549	545	549	545	549	545	549		
Exempt	52	59	*	*	61	64	6	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	9.5%	10.7%	0.4%	0.7%	11.2%	11.7%	1.1%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	3.82%	4.22%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	580	567	580	567	580	567	580	567	580	567	580	567		
Exempt	45	59	*	*	53	67	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	7.8%	10.4%	0.3%	0.4%	9.1%	11.8%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	3.05%	3.94%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	542	530	542	530	542	530	542	530	542	530	542	530		
Exempt	33	31	11	*	28	21	11	*	11	*	11	*		
% Exempt	6.1%	5.8%	2.0%	0.8%	5.2%	4.0%	2.0%	0.8%	2.0%	0.8%	2.0%	0.8%	3.23%	2.14%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Saint Mary's County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1122	1141	1122	1141	1122	1141	1122	1141	1122	1141	1122	1141		
Exempt	84	35	6	5	80	38	26	5	6	5	6	5		
% Exempt	7.5%	3.1%	0.5%	0.4%	7.1%	3.3%	2.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	4%	3.09%	1.36%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1169	1195	1169	1195	1169	1195	1169	1195	1169	1195	1169	1195		
Exempt	94	32	*	9	107	40	*	9	*	9	*	9		
% Exempt	8.0%	2.7%	0.3%	0.8%	9.2%	3.3%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.8%	3.09%	1.51

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1054	1122	1054	1122	1054	1122	1054	1122	1054	1122	1054	1122		
Exempt	74	16	20	10	74	19	20	10	20	10	20	10		
% Exempt	7.0%	1.4%	1.9%	0.9%	7.0%	1.7%	1.9%	0.9%	1.9%	0.9%	1.9%	0.9%	3.61%	1.11%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Somerset County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	219	258	219	258	219	258	219	258	219	258	219	258		
Exempt	10	9	6	*	7	9	6	*	6	*	6	*		
% Exempt	4.6%	3.5%	2.7%	0.8%	3.2%	3.5%	2.7%	0.8%	2.7%	0.8%	2.7%	0.8%	3.12%	1.68%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Aver	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	198	222	198	222	198	222	198	222	198	222	198	222		
Exempt	11	16	0	*	0	9	0	*	0	*	0	*		
% Exempt	5.6%	7.2%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.4%	0.93%	2.78%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	225	223	225	223	225	223	225	223	225	223	225	223		
Exempt	12	10	0	0	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0		
% Exempt	5.3%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.63%	1.42%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Talbot County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	372	328	372	328	372	328	372	328	372	328	372	328		
Exempt	30	26	*	6	19	22	15	6	*	6	*	6		
% Exempt	8.0%	7.9%	0.5%	1.8%	5.1%	6.7%	4.0%	1.8%	0.5%	1.8%	0.5%	1.8%	3.14%	3.66%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	363	336	363	336	363	336	363	336	363	336	363	336		
Exempt	35	22	8	*	38	27	8	*	8	*	8	*		
% Exempt	9.6%	6.5%	2.2%	0.3%	10.4%	8.0%	2.2%	0.3%	2.2%	0.3%	2.2%	0.3%	4.82%	2.63%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	347	343	347	343	347	343	347	343	347	343	347	343		
Exempt	17	26	*	6	30	34	*	6	*	6	*	6		
% Exempt	4.9%	7.6%	1.2%	1.7%	8.6%	9.9%	1.2%	1.7%	1.2%	1.7%	1.2%	1.7%	3.03%	4.08%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Washington County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1569	1526	1569	1526	1569	1526	1569	1526	1569	1526	1569	1526		
Exempt	120	97	8	10	106	97	12	10	8	10	8	10		
% Exempt	7.6%	6.4%	0.5%	0.7%	6.8%	6.4%	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.7%	2.78%	2.56%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1558	1547	1558	1547	1558	1547	1558	1547	1558	1547	1558	1547		
Exempt	140	124	10	13	92	106	10	13	10	13	10	13		
% Exempt	9.0%	8.0%	0.6%	0.8%	5.9%	6.9%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	2.91%	3.04%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1531	1547	1531	1547	1531	1547	1531	1547	1531	1547	1531	1547		
Exempt	81	99	15	33	31	54	15	33	15	33	15	33		
% Exempt	5.3%	6.4%	1.0%	2.1%	2.0%	3.5%	1.0%	2.1%	1.0%	2.1%	1.0%	2.1%	1.87%	3.07%

Wicomico County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1153	1151	1153	1151	1153	1151	1153	1151	1153	1151	1153	1151		
Exempt	89	73	21	6	76	74	36	6	21	6	21	6		
% Exempt	7.7%	6.3%	1.8%	0.5%	6.6%	6.4%	3.1%	0.5%	1.8%	0.5%	1.8%	0.5%	3.82%	2.48%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Aver	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1129	1125	1129	1125	1129	1125	1129	1125	1129	1125	1129	1125		
Exempt	94	82	21	16	95	80	21	16	21	16	21	16		
% Exempt	8.3%	7.3%	1.9%	1.4%	8.4%	7.1%	1.9%	1.4%	1.9%	1.4%	1.9%	1.4%	4.03%	3.35%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	1039	996	1039	996	1039	996	1039	996	1039	996	1039	996		
Exempt	25	18	14	9	32	9	14	9	14	9	14	9		
% Exempt	2.4%	1.8%	1.3%	0.9%	3.1%	0.9%	1.3%	0.9%	1.3%	0.9%	1.3%	0.9%	1.81%	1.05%

Worcester County 2000 and 2001 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	511	498	511	498	511	498	511	498	511	498	511	498		
Exempt	*	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	0		
% Exempt	0.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.10%	0.17%

Grade 5														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	nce	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	552	527	552	527	552	527	552	527	552	527	552	527		
Exempt	6	8	0	*	0	11	0	*	0	*	0	*		
% Exempt	1.1%	1.5%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.18%	0.73%

Grade 8														
Content	Read	ding	Wri	ting	Languag	e Usage	Mathe	matics	Scie	ence	Social S	Studies	Avera	age %
Year	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
Total	481	545	481	545	481	545	481	545	481	545	481	545		
Exempt	18	26	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0		
% Exempt	3.7%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.62%	1.25%

^{*} Fewer than five students

Appendix B

Local School System Profiles

Allegany County

2000-2001

		Mary	land School Perfo	ormance Assess	ment Program (I	MSPAP) – Satisf	actory						
	Third Grade Fifth Grade Eighth Grade												
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	40.4	54.7	51.4	47.2	47.0	47.0	18.2	51.8	55.3				
Special Ed													

		Maryland	Functional Test (MFT)	– Passing								
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade											
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics						
Regular Ed	100.0	97.2	93.9	100.0	99.1	99.0						
Special Ed	9											

% Regular	41.4	83.9
% Resource	42.5	03.7
% Separate	1.9	

	Attendand	e		Drop Out
	Elementary	Middle	High	Drop Out
Regular Education	95.9	95.0	93.6	3.31
Special Education	95.1	92.2	89.3	5.96

Per Pupil Cost: \$7,770 Professional Instructional Staff: \$41,186

Special School and Other: 268 or 14.2%

Anne Arundel County

2000-2001

		Mary	land School Perf	ormance Assess	ment Program (I	MSPAP) – Satisf	actory						
	Third Grade Fifth Grade Eighth Grade												
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	42.7	53.3	45.2	53.8	49.9	53.7	28.1	54.9	56.9				
Special Ed	* 												

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	Reading Writing Mathematics Reading Writing Mathema									
Regular Ed	99.4	94.7	90.1	100.0	99.0	98.2					
Special Ed	89.5	73.5	75.6	96.3	93.0	94.8					

% Regular	51.4	68.0
% Resource	16.6	00.0
% Separate	15.1	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Diop Out
Regular Education	95.5	94.4	93.5	3.98
Special Education	94.4	92.3	90.6	6.86

Per Pupil Cost: \$7,911

Professional Instructional Staff: \$45,693

Special School and Other: 1,706 or 16.9%

Baltimore City

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	18.2	32.3	21.7	24.0	28.3	26.6	11.0	33.1	16.8				
Special Ed	9.6	13.8	12.0	5.6	7.4	6.9	1.0	5.7	1.9				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	ding Writing Mathematics Reading Writing Mathema				Mathematics					
Regular Ed	95.0	82.0	65.2	98.6	93.9	82.1					
Special Ed	62.7	31.2	30.3	83.8	60.0	57.7					

% Regular	25.0	37.3
% Resource	12.3	37.0
% Separate	44.9	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Drop Out
Regular Education	94.1	88.4	81.8	11.53
Special Education	92.6	84.6	73.7	10.19

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,676

Professional Instructional Staff: \$43,828

Special School and Other: 2,957 or 17.7%

Baltimore County

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory											
Third Grade				Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade					
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics			
Regular Ed	45.1	54.9	43.1	52.3	49.2	50.5	34.7	59.4	55.1			
Special Ed	38.9	51.1	40.1	36.7	35.0	31.1	7.6	24.5	19.0			

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	Writing	Writing Mathematics Reading Writing Mathematics								
Regular Ed	99.6	97.5	88.8	100.0	99.7	97.5					
Special Ed	92.3	81.6	83.2	99.2	96.6	97.6					

% Regular	41.3	59.2
% Resource	17.9	37.2
% Separate	22.5	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Drop Out
Regular Education	95.7	94.9	93.8	2.82
Special Education	94.5	92.8	92.5	0.25

Per Pupil Cost: \$7,281

Professional Instructional Staff: \$45,512

Special School and Other: 2,432 or 18.3%

Calvert County 2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	48.9	65.0	51.5	62.5	61.1	60.2	37.2	68.2	71.0				
Special Ed	29.7	35.6	20.6	32.3	27.8	23.5	12.2	26.2	21.5				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading Writing Mathematics							
Regular Ed	99.9	99.2	95.7	100.0	99.9	98.5					
Special Ed	96.5	96.4	91.4	98.5	100.0	98.5					

% Regular	37.9	63.7
% Resource	25.8	05.7
% Separate	20.0	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Drop Out
Regular Education	95.4	95.3	94.1	3.91
Special Education	94.9	93.9	92.6	0.87

Per Pupil Cost: \$7,622

Professional Instructional Staff: \$47,748

Special School and Other: 352 or 16.3%

Caroline County

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory											
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade					
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics			
Regular Ed	44.9	52.9	47.4	48.0	44.3	54.4	38.6	62.5	49.1			
Special Ed	23.3	52.4	44.4	25.0	35.9	43.8	4.8	18.4	4.1			

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade											
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading Writing Mathematics							
Regular Ed	99.0	96.3	96.6	100.0	99.3	98.4					
Special Ed	78.3	68.9	100.0	100.0	77.8						

% Regular	49.5	81.0
% Resource	31.5	01.0
% Separate	7.6	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Drop Out
Regular Education	95.3	94.0	92.3	5.01
Special Education	94.0	91.4	91.5	0.00

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,741

Professional Instructional Staff: \$40,612

Special School and Other: 88 or 11.3%

Carroll County 2000–2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	40.8	53.9	46.3	50.8	54.3	52.4	33.4	64.6	68.1				
Special Ed	29.1	41.0	29.5	21.8	30.3	21.6	6.8	21.3	24.1				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading Writing Mathematics							
Regular Ed	100.0	99.4	96.5	100.0	99.9	98.8					
Special Ed	94.9	95.2	84.2	99.5	99.0	97.0					

% Regular	71.6	83.3
% Resource	11.7	03.3
% Separate	5.5	·

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Drop Out
Regular Education	95.7	95.6	94.8	2.07
Special Education	95.0	94.4	92.7	3.03

Per Pupil Cost: \$7,104

Professional Instructional Staff: \$45,710

Special School and Other: 419 or 11.1%

Cecil County 2000–2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
Third Grade				Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	49.1	55.5	48.3	57.0	53.9	54.9	29.7	60.5	58.4				
Special Ed	43.5	59.0	46.0	39.2	42.9	30.0	1.9	15.7	11.1				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade											
	Reading	Writing	Writing Mathematics Reading Writing Mathematics								
Regular Ed	99.9	98.7	93.4	100.0	99.9	99.4					
Special Ed	100.0	88.1	60.0	100.0	98.6	95.7					

% Regular	51.3	75.7
% Resource	24.4	13.1
% Separate	13.3	•

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Drop Out
Regular Education	95.0	93.4	91.2	3.88
Special Education	93.4	91.4	88.9	1.10

Per Pupil Cost: \$7,261

Professional Instructional Staff: \$42,656

Special School and Other: 281 or 11.0%

Charles County 2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	37.0	47.9	37.2	50.8	43.6	48.7	37.2	62.1	56.1				
Special Ed	21.7	32.1	16.7	30.0	19.6	16.0	10.0	17.0	12.8				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading Writing Mathematics							
Regular Ed	99.4	97.4	88.9	99.9	99.3	97.0					
Special Ed	88.8	79.7	77.6	97.5	93.2	95.0					

% Regular	47.8	67.4
% Resource	19.6	07.4
% Separate	20.5	·

	Drop Out			
	High	Drop Out		
Regular Education	98.1	97.8	96.9	3.65
Special Education	97.9	96.7	95.8	0.00

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,639

Professional Instructional Staff: \$43,474 Special School and Other: 323 or 12.1%

Dorchester County

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	32.8	45.6	35.5	39.0	40.2	36.3	17.7	45.8	32.4				
Special Ed	26.3	32.5	30.0	35.4	26.1	29.5	5.6	11.9	2.4				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade											
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading Writing Mathematics							
Regular Ed	98.7	94.6	74.6	100.0	99.7	93.7					
Special Ed	69.8	48.8	27.9	93.3	86.7	90.0					

% Regular	70.1	81.0
% Resource	10.9	01.0
% Separate	11.2	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Diop Out
Regular Education	94.8	92.5	90.7	3.42
Special Education	93.9	92.1	83.4	6.51

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,376

Professional Instructional Staff: \$44,720

Special School and Other: 49 or 7.8%

Frederick County

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	47.7	57.1	52.7	57.4	55.4	59.3	34.2	65.7	68.5				
Special Ed	25.9	34.8	22.6	23.6	24.5	20.2	9.3	27.9	27.1				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade											
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading Writing Mathematics							
Regular Ed	99.5	96.6	94.1	100.0	99.3	98.4					
Special Ed	90.7	76.2	77.7	98.3	91.1	96.6					

% Regular	58.6	78.6
% Resource	20.0	70.0
% Separate	8.7	

	Drop Out			
	High	Drop Out		
Regular Education	95.2	94.1	92.3	2.27
Special Education	94.1	91.5	89.1	7.48

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,582 Professional Instructional Staff: \$44,786

Special School and Other: 566 or 12.7%

Garrett County

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
	Third Grade				Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade					
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	30.4	43.5	34.0	43.1	47.2	41.5	25.0	51.0	62.7				
Special Ed									27.4				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade											
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics Reading Writing Mathematics								
Regular Ed	99.7	97.2	90.7	100.0	99.7	98.6					
Special Ed	95.3	73.8	79.5	97.3	94.4	100.0					

% Regular	42.1	73.4
% Resource	31.3	73.2
% Separate	16.5	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Diop Out
Regular Education	96.1	95.6	95.2	3.37
Special Education	95.4	95.2	94.6	13.87

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,645

Professional Instructional Staff: \$39,896

Special School and Other: 80 or 10.1%

Harford County

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	47.8	61.7	53.4	56.1	52.4	56.1	34.6	69.2	65.2				
Special Ed	27.6	37.6	29.1	34.4	31.0	26.4	13.3	32.7	23.3				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Mathematics Reading Writing Mathematics							
Regular Ed	97.1	94.8	90.9	99.1	98.7	97.5					
Special Ed	89.9	78.4	76.9	98.1	96.5	98.1					

% Regular	44.2	81.3
% Resource	37.1	01.0
% Separate	4.2	·

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Diop Out
Regular Education	95.4	94.4	92.6	3.29
Special Education	94.4	92.5	89.6	5.22

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,747

Professional Instructional Staff: \$42,971

Special School and Other: 818 or 14.4%

Howard County 2000–2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	61.2	67.4	60.1	68.3	63.7	63.5	41.7	62.1	71.2				
Special Ed	38.4	36.8	28.3	36.9	25.9	27.4	14.2	26.4	29.3				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading Writing Mathematics							
Regular Ed	99.5	97.3	94.8	99.9	99.4	98.8					
Special Ed	96.6	81.9	84.1	97.7	94.9	97.2					

% Regular	42.4	75.8
% Resource	33.4	13.0
% Senarate	6.6	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Diop Out
Regular Education	96.1	95.7	95.2	2.03
Special Education	95.2	93.3	92.9	0.45

Per Pupil Cost: \$7,396

Professional Instructional Staff: \$46,476

Special School and Other: 824 or 17.7%

Kent County

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
	Third Grade				Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade					
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	57.5	60.3	70.7	52.5	41.0	44.3	48.4	62.4	68.8				
Special Ed	46.7	60.0	76.7	35.3	16.2	18.9	9.1	18.2	9.1				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade											
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading Writing Mathematics							
Regular Ed	99.0	98.5	94.5	100.0	100.0	97.7					
Special Ed	55.0	33.3	33.3	85.7	85.7	78.6					

% Regular	52.2	77.8
% Resource	25.6	
% Separate	15.3	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Diop Out
Regular Education	95.4	94.4	91.2	3.89
Special Education	93.9	92.0	89.9	1.35

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,512

Professional Instructional Staff: \$46,216

Special School and Other: 24 or 6.9%

Montgomery County 2000–2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	39.1	55.2	46.9	51.9	53.7	58.2	35.9	61.5	68.9				
Special Ed	21.7	37.9	21.7	26.9	29.2	22.5	11.0	25.4	24.8				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading Writing Mathematics							
Regular Ed	99.3	96.3	91.1	99.9	99.4	97.0					
Special Ed	93.7	73.7	80.6	99.1	96.3	95.7					

% Regular	34.5	53.8
% Resource	19.3	
% Separate	30.2	

	Attendance								
	Elementary	Middle	High	Drop Out					
Regular Education	95.6	95.2	92.7	1.58					
Special Education	94.4	92.9	89.2	2.38					

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,946

Professional Instructional Staff: \$52,594

Special School and Other: 2,629 or 16.1%

Prince George's County

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	21.7	36.5	20.2	27.2	29.5	23.2	19.1	43.7	27.2				
Special Ed	16.3	28.1	19.8	14.2	16.2	11.0	3.6	11.9	5.7				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	Writing	Writing Mathematics Reading Writing Mathematics								
Regular Ed	98.4	91.1	65.8	99.5	98.3	90.4					
Special Ed	85.6	61.7	48.1	94.4	88.2	81.5					

% Regular	39.0	63.
% Resource	24.1	03.
% Separate	18.8	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Drop Out
Regular Education	95.1	95.6	93.3	3.00
Special Education	93.0	93.8	91.2	1.84

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,396

Professional Instructional Staff: \$45,449

Special School and Other: 2,645 or 18.1%

Queen Anne's County

2000-2001

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade					
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics			
Regular Ed	44.1	60.0	47.6	51.8	48.6	55.6	32.3	52.1	61.9			
Special Ed	15.8	31.2	20.4	22.4	32.1	16.0	7.8	23.3	12.2			

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	Writing Mathematics Reading Writing Mathematics									
Regular Ed	99.8	88.6	89.3	100.0	99.7	98.7					
Special Ed	91.4	70.8	93.5	91.3	91.3						

% Regular	41.1	85.9
% Resource	44.8	05.1
% Separate	3.3	

	Drop Out			
	Middle	High	Diop Out	
Regular Education	95.0	94.3	91.5	2.96
Special Education	94.3	92.7	88.4	5.92

Per Pupil Cost: \$7,724

Professional Instructional Staff: \$41,926

Special School and Other: 110 or 10.9%

Saint Mary's County 2000–2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
	Third Grade				Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade					
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	41.6	53.2	41.8	48.8	46.8	46.8	26.8	54.8	51.8				
Special Ed									18.4				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
	Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade										
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics Reading Writing Mathematics								
Regular Ed	99.1	94.1	82.2	99.6	99.1	96.9					
Special Ed	87.4	72.2	48.6	95.3	87.7	88.7					

% Regular	48.2	76.6
% Resource	28.4	70.0
% Separate	13.1	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Diop Out
Regular Education	94.8	93.0	90.7	2.80
Special Education	94.1	90.8	87.7	3.63

Per Pupil Cost: \$7,948

Professional Instructional Staff: \$43,812

Special School and Other: 213 or 10.3%

Somerset County

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade						
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	29.2	34.9	24.4	34.8	35.3	39.1	22.3	53.5	44.6				
Special Ed	7.1	22.9	5.7	14.3	7.4	14.8	12.5	55.6	33.3				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade											
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics					
Regular Ed	98.4	87.5	83.5	99.3	98.6	97.9					
Special Ed	84.6	73.1	69.2	82.4	100.0	82.4					

% Regular	64.6	76.7
% Resource	12.1	70.
% Separate	14.4	

	Drop Out			
	High	Drop Out		
Regular Education	94.2	93.5	94.4	6.87
Special Education	93.3	92.9	92.8	8.74

Per Pupil Cost: \$10,201

Professional Instructional Staff: \$40,831

Special School and Other: 35 or 8.8%

Talbot County

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory											
		Third Grade		Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade					
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics			
Regular Ed	28.3	41.4	27.9	49.8	42.7	46.5	21.8	44.4	57.0			
Special Ed	6.7	14.3	5.7	33.3	9.5	14.3	0.0	13.0	8.7			

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade											
	Reading	Writing	Writing Mathematics Reading Writing Mathe			Mathematics					
Regular Ed	100.0	92.5	95.9	99.6	99.2	98.0					
Special Ed	85.7	65.9	69.0	94.1	88.2	94.1					

% Regular	61.5	81.
% Resource	19.6	01.
% Separate	8.3	·

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Diop Out
Regular Education	96.1	94.7	95.3	2.17
Special Education	95.4	93.7	92.9	6.62

Per Pupil Cost: \$7,042

Professional Instructional Staff: \$40,805

Special School and Other: 53 or 10.5%

Washington County 2000–2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory												
	Third Grade				Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade					
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics				
Regular Ed	51.4	57.5	50.0	58.9	54.7	62.4	32.4	61.4	69.5				
Special Ed	40.4	46.6	33.2	33.1	33.9	28.9	9.6	19.0	18.2				

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing											
Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade											
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics					
Regular Ed	99.6	96.0	94.9	99.7	98.4	98.9					
Special Ed	95.6	79.6	87.7	100.0	95.2	98.4					

% Regular	67.9	 79.5
% Resource	11.6	
% Separate	5.6	·

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Diop Out
Regular Education	96.1	95.4	95.1	3.26
Special Education	95.2	93.9	93.5	6.91

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,901

Professional Instructional Staff: \$42,794

Special School and Other: 444 or 15.0%

Wicomico County

2000-2001

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory											
	Third Grade				Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade				
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics			
Regular Ed	30.6	46.6	32.7	40.2	42.2	42.7	20.5	48.0	39.6			
Special Ed	23.2	41.2	35.2	24.5	29.4	22.1	4.9	19.8	9.9			

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing								
Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade								
	Reading	Writing	iting Mathematics Reading Writing Math		Mathematics			
Regular Ed	97.5	90.5	86.5	99.7	99.2	98.0		
Special Ed	86.7	56.3	67.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		

% Regular	58.3	69.
% Resource	10.8	<u> </u>
% Separate	17.4	

	Drop Out			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Diop Out
Regular Education	95.1	92.7	90.9	5.45
Special Education	94.1	89.4	88.9	0.00

Per Pupil Cost: \$6,883

Professional Instructional Staff: \$41,750

Special School and Other: 229 or 13.4%

Worcester County

2000-2001

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Satisfactory									
	Third Grade Fifth Grade Eighth Grade								
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	54.8	68.5	52.9	56.4	51.3	56.0	36.9	65.8	70.0
Special Ed	19.0	38.5	16.9	18.0	27.9	19.1	11.1	17.7	19.4

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Passing								
Ninth Grade Eleventh Grade								
	Reading	Writing Mathematics Reading Writ		Writing	Mathematics			
Regular Ed	100.0	94.3	93.7	100.0	98.4	96.8		
Special Ed	90.9	81.8	96.4	100.0	90.9	96.4		

% Regular	62.0	82.6
% Resource	20.6	02.0
% Separate	9.4	

	Drop Out			
	Drop Out			
Regular Education	95.1	94.9	93.5	1.80
Special Education	94.4	93.4	91.7	4.59

Per Pupil Cost: \$8,029

Professional Instructional Staff: \$43,064

Special School and Other: 72 or 8.0%

Appendix C

School System CSPD Submissions

Allegany County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Read and Succeed	Т	40	10	0	5
Positive Behavior Supports	S	50	20	10	5
School-wide Discipline	S	50	20	10	5
IDEA	Т	100	150	25	25
Functional Behavior Assessment	S/T	20	50	0	10
Inclusion	S/T	200	25	25	25
Learning Strategies	S	50	30	0	10
Change Agent	A	50	50	5	5

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

Crisis Intervention Training, CPI, Read and Succeed, Autism, Transitioning – Curriculum Development, Inclusion/High School Assessments, IDEA/504, FBA/BIP, Discipline/Suspensions

^{*} A? Awareness Level; S? Skill Development Level; T? Transfer Level

Anne Arundel County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Paraprofessionals Training	S	0	100	25	0
Paraprofessionals Orientation	A	0	60	0	10
Leadership Development	Т	0	70	0	0
Learning Lab Technician Meetings	S	0	60	0	0
ECI Transition Meetings	Т	0	75	25	75

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

Training for Inclusion Teachers; New Teacher support; General Education Content; Training; Paraprofessional Orientation; Paraprofessional Training; Writing Effective Behavior Intervention Plans; Practical Applications; Learning Lab Technician Conferences; Leadership Development

^{*} A ? Awareness Level; S ? Skill Development Level; T ? Transfer Level

Baltimore City Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Child Study Teams Training	S/T	300	200	450	0
Policies and Procedures	A/S/T	150	500	150	0
Placement in the Least Restrictive Environment	A/S/T	400	300	450	0
IEP Implementation	A/S/T	500	1000	100	50
Inclusionary Practices	S/T	300	260	50	0
Pre-referral Interventions	S/T	100	150	150	0
Behavior Management/Crisis Intervention	S/T	1500	300	350	0
Instructional Practices for Low Incidence Groups	A/S/T	200	500	50	0
Adaptations, modifications, and accommodations	A/S/T	200	500	50	0

- Training for new IEP Instructional Associates;
- Training for Child Study Team on standard operating procedures;
- Training for teachers of vision and hearing impaired students;
- Training for preschool teachers;
- Training for teachers and administrators of MOIL/SPH, SED, LD, and PAL students;
- Training of school-based administrators and support team members on special education training in LRE, inclusion, and IEP implementation;
- Training for new and probationary teachers;
- Training in curriculum modifications, adaptations, and accommodations.

^{*} A ? Awareness Level; S ? Skill Development Level; T ? Transfer Level

Baltimore County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Computerized IEP	S/T	0	250	50	0
Wilson Reading	S/T	0	50	0	0
Functional Behavior Assessment	S/T	0	100	0	0
Crisis Prevention	S/T	100	100	0	50
Personal Assistant Training	S/T	0	0	0	200
IMAP	S/T	0	100	50	75
Parent Training	A/S/T	0	0	0	100
New Teachers	S/T	0	150	20	0
Compliance	A/S/T	0	0	0	0
Collaboration	A/S/T	0	0	0	0
Autism	A/S/T	0	30	10	50

Emotional Disturbance	S/T	0	100	0	0
Educational Assessment	S/T	0	400	0	0

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

Project READ; IMAP; Crisis Prevention Institute; Autism Computerized IEP; Compliance, Transitioning; Parent Training; Working with emotionally disturbed, Utilizing the revised Woodcock-Johnson; Proactive strategies; FBA & Behavior Plan training.

^{*} A ? Awareness Level; S ? Skill Development Level; T ? Transfer Level

Calvert County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Crisis Prevention	S	15	15	15	0
Behavior Management	Т	20	10	0	0
Reading Strategies/ Languages	Т	3	7	0	100
Area of Disabilities	A	0	0	0	0

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Crisis Prevention, Behavior Management, Reading Strategies (Language, LiPS), Reauthorization Changes

^{*} A? Awareness Level; S? Skill Development Level; T? Transfer Level

Caroline County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Transitioning	S	50	54	4	5
IMAP Prep	Т	25	13	7	7
FBA/BIP	Т	100	54	7	7
Differentiate Instruction	Т	100	54	0	0
Co-Teaching	Т	100	54	5	20
Lindamood-Bell	A	15	15	0	9
Reading Interventions	S	100	54	0	9

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: IMAP Prep, IDEA Regulations, Crisis Intervention, Lindamood Bell training and implementation, Transitioning, Co-teaching

^{*} A ? Awareness Level; S ? Skill Development Level; T ? Transfer Level

Carroll County Public Schools

School Year 2001 - 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Collaborating Teaching	Т	375	100	10	10
IEP Evaluating/Writing	S/T	3	300	100	65
Computer IEP	S/T	100	300	50	25
Autism	S/T	5	0	20	10
IDEA '97/ COMAR '99	S/T	1000	300	75	25
СРІ	S/T	15	25	10	5
Consultation Modification	A/S/T	50	20	10	10

ADD/ADHD	S/T	50	100	15	10
Sensory Integration	A/S/T	0	0	8	2

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: During the 2000-2001 school year, training for all staff was held during regularly schedule in-service days, after school training, and evening meetings. Staff attending national level conference and staff conference such as: LDA, MSHA, and LRP Legal Conference. All activities scheduled have been completed to support all students. Staff of general and special educators were trained in the Instructional Consultation Team (ICT) model at four new schools. Additionally, all school psychologists and consulting special education teachers received advance training. Collaborative instruction remains a priority of both general and special education staff.

^{*} A? Awareness Level; S? Skill Development Level; T? Transfer Level

Cecil County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Inclusion	A/S/T	20	20	0	0
Procedural Safeguards	A/S/T	10	20	20	0
IDEA Regulations	A/S/T	20	20	0	0
Proactive Discipline	A/S/T	40	40	40	0
PASS Training	A/S/T	30	30	0	0
Program Development	A/S/T	30	30	0	0

- 1. Due process procedures training.
- 2. IDEA regulation training.
- 3. Monitoring and Evaluation training.
- 4. PASS training for Building Coordinators and Building Administrators.
- 5. Inclusion strategies for special education general educators through in-service/conference.
- 6. Program development through participation in State and regional conference.
- 7. Proactive Discipline for special education and general educators.

Charles County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Autism	S/T	0	30	25	0
Behavior Management	S/T	75	100	0	0
Development of Social Skills (primary)	A	15	20	25	0

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Assistive Communication (Augmentative Communication)-11/01,1/02, 3/02, 5/02; Development of Social Emotional Skill (primary level)-9/01; Autism-Best Practices-11/01, 03/02; Autism-Best Practice-11/01, 03/02; Auti

^{*} A ? Awareness Level; S ? Skill Development Level; T ? Transfer Level

Dorchester County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Inclusive Instruction/Collaborative	S/T	25	15	6	0
Compliance-Policy and Procedures Implementation	Т	10	50	10	0
IMAP Framework/Assessment	Т	10	12	8	0

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Policy and Procedures-Inservice was provided regarding changes and updates to local policy and procedures, Handbooks, revised documents, team materials and administrative materials were reviewed and disseminated, IMAP-Staff training were provided to review 2001 administration, to align the framework and the DCPS objective bank, and to provide technical assistance in determining appropriateness of IMAP vs. MSPAP for students. Inclusive Planning and Teaching-Collaborative teaching partners reviewed curriculum documents and included differentiated teaching strategies and materials. Two 2-½ hr. after school in-service were provided for staff from several schools regarding differentiated instruction and collaborative teaching. "Dinner and movie" was used as method to provide the professional development opportunity

^{*} A ? Awareness Level; S ? Skill Development Level; T ? Transfer Level

Frederick County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
PDD/Autism	A/S/T	25	50	15	0
Managing Difficult Behaviors	A/S/T	50	60	10	0

- 1. Autism training for 3 days for all schools having autistic children. This includes administrators, 45 teachers (special education and general education) two speech/language pathologists, and 28 instructional assistants.
- 2. Specific training was held for behavior management of included students with special needs.

^{*} A ? Awareness Level; S ? Skill Development Level; T ? Transfer Level

Garrett County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Understanding MSPAP Writing Demands	S/T	0	10	1	0
Content Mentoring High School	S/T	5	3	0	0
Physical Restraint	S	8	4	0	0
Writing IEP's	S/T	0	7	0	0

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Submission notes "Please see attached", but attachment not available with submission.

^{*} A? Awareness Level; S? Skill Development Level; T? Transfer Level

Harford County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Reading methodology	S	0	80	0	0
Content Enhancement	S	10	10	0	0
Legal Issues	Т	0	5	0	0
Facilitative IEP Training	Т	10	2	0	0
IMAP	Т	0	20	0	0

- Training of all additional staff in reading methodology (Project Read- Levels I and II
- Legal training-Administrative staff
- IEP Development-Computerized program

Howard County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Reading Instructional Strategies	A/S/T	10	170	0	0
Effective IEP Teams	Т	18	18	36	0
Procedural Safeguards	A/S/T	40	70	30	0
Leadership Training	Т	0	135	5	0
IMAP Training	A/S/T	0	35	0	0
ESY Training	Т	0	100	25	0
IEP Training (New Teachers)	A	0	30	10	0

- Improving the IEP Team Meeting Process
- Procedural Safeguards for New Personnel
- Special Education Team Leader Training Special Education new Teacher Training
- Reading Instructional Strategies

Kent County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A/S/T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Multi-Sensory Reading Strategies	S/T	33	10	4	4
Instructional Intervention	S/T	150	30	10	10
Collaboration	A/S	150	30	10	10
IEP Process	S/T	0	10	0	5

- Work for general/special educators on co-teaching.
- All Instructional Assistants trained (6 hrs.) crisis intervention.
- Implementation of IC Model in four elementary buildings. Trained special educators in assessment principles.
- AT team formed and completed training.
- In-service special educators. In-service special educators.
- In-service for special educators on IEP writing.
- Trained core team on Excent

Montgomery County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Classroom management and behavior	S	50	200	50	0
Assistive Technology	S	0	200	0	0
Reading Literacy	S	0	100	0	0
Learning for Independence Curriculum	S	0	50	0	0
Inclusive Education	S	10	30	10	0

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Content modules; reading literacy; assistive technology; Autism curriculum; and transition to adult.

^{*} A ? Awareness Level; S ? Skill Development Level; T ? Transfer Level

Prince George's County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Assuring FAPE/Inclusive Environments	A/S/T	500	1600	250	50
New Woodcock Johnson	A/S/T	0	1000	250	50
Development of IEP's	A/S/T	0	1000	250	50
Functional Behavioral Assessment Plans	A/S/T	50	500	250	50
Alternative Interim Programs	A/S/T	200	1000	250	50
Autism Waiver	S/T	50	100	150	10
Accessing the General Curriculum	A/S/T	50	500	150	20
Transition Services	A/S/T	50	250	50	500
MSPAP/CRT/IMAP/High School Assessments	S/T	50	500	50	20
ESY	S/T	50	1000	200	50
Pre-referral Interventions	A/S/T	500	200	50	100
Discipline	A/S/T	500	500	100	100

- 1.1 Training and orientation of staff on change in policies and procedures, up-dating staff.
- 1.2 Use of Excent as part of the IEP decision-making process;
- 2.1 Training on FBA's/FBP'S-emphasis on modifying and revising as student's needs change
- 3.1 Training on Second Steps, Cooperative Discipline, Nonviolent Crisis Prevention, School-wide supports
- 4.1 Training on development of alternative interim programs
- 5.1 Training on math, social studies, and reading curriculum
- 6.1 Career Expo, transition workshop for students and parents
- 6.2 Training on incorporation of transition goals on IEP, anticipated services;
- 7.1 Training on best practices model; working with student with autism in inclusive environments
- 8.1 Training on behavior support systems, integration into comprehension school activities and classes
- 9.1 Training on inclusion of special education students on MSPAP and CTBS; appropriate accommodations
- 9.2 Up-date on status of H.S. Assessments; inclusion of special educators in general education training sessions
- 10.1 Training on ESY criteria, eligibility and potential service models
- 11.1 Training on completion of Medicaid reporting forms
- 12.1 Training on changes on SSIS

Queen Anne's County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Inclusion Practices	A/S/T	40	20	5	10
IEP Development	S/T	5	20	10	5
Sp. Ed. Procedures	A/S/T	5	30	20	15
Excent	S/T	0	40	20	0
Technology Applications	S/T	0	20	10	5

- Inclusion topics (in cooperation with MCIE)
- IEP Chairpersons Meetings
- Instructional Use of Technology
- EXCENT Updates
- Disproportionality Issue
- Testing Issue

Saint Mary's County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Autism	S/T	0	25	5	0
LRE, IEP development	S/T	80	100	50	0
Reading	S/T	0	50	10	0
Collaborating of regular and special education staff	S/T	10	10	0	0
Working with students with hearing loss		0	0	0	0

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: As a part of our initiative to improve the reading performance of students with disabilities, the Office of Special Education presented training in Lindamood Phoneme Sequence to special education teachers and speech pathologists. In addition, teachers of the hearing impaired and speech pathologists received training in language development of students with hearing loss. Resource staffs were given the opportunity to attend the Council for paraprofessional trainings and collaboration. Speech pathologists were trained in the Hanen method to certify them to provided instruction for parents in techniques for language development.

^{*} A ? Awareness Level; S ? Skill Development Level; T ? Transfer Level

Somerset County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Ed Identification	A/S/T	20	25	10	20
Behavior Management	A/S/T	30	25	10	20

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Autism Conference-7 teachers, 1 O T, 1 Psychologist O T-Annual Conference-1 O T National ASHS Conference-3 speech pathologists MACA Conference – 1 teacher, 3 speech pathologists, Infant/Toddler Coordinator Vision Impaired Conference – 2 teachers, 1 Instructional Assistant Aspergers Conference –4 teachers

^{*} A? Awareness Level; S? Skill Development Level; T? Transfer Level

Talbot County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Lindamood Bell (Reading)	A	5	25	5	0
Inclusion	A/S/T	25	10	5	0
Mathematics w/Manipulatives	A	20	10	0	0
Autism	A	2	5	5	0
Assessments	A/S	0	20	5	0
Training for Instructional Assistants	A/S/T	0	0	0	15

- Autism both nationally and through PG County Project
- Lindamood Bell-LIPS Programs
- Inclusion-MD Collation of Inclusion
- Modifications and Accommodations to Instruction to each school faculty
- USE course for teachers
- Each half-day training to special education instructional assistance on a wide variety of topics to include: behavioral management, communication skills, and reading intervention.
- Assistive technology training
- Special Education Policy/Procedure/IEP Development

Washington County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Effective Practices		0	0	0	0
Alternative Reading Strategies	A/S/T	200	50	10	
Pre-referral Intervention	A/S/T	200	10	0	
Preschool Inclusion Study Skills	A/S/T	20	5	3	
Positive Behavior Support	A/S/T	0	50	0	50 Inst. Assist
Procedural Update	A/S	0	150	0	0
Transitioning	A/S/T	0	50	0	0
Threat Assessment	A/S/T	0	25	8	25 Admin.
Computerized IEP	A/S/T	0	60	20	0
School-Based Training	A/S/T	40	10	10	10 Admin.

Woodcock Johnson	A/S/T	0	50	0	0
Discipline	A/S/T	50	50	0	0
Learning Strategies	A/S/T	30	10	0	0
Managing Angry in Children	A/S/T	40	30	10	Parent

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Autism-Instructional Assistants, General Ed Teacher, Special Education Teachers, Parents-45 participants Study Skills-General and Special Education Teachers, 30 middle/high school teachers Transitioning – All Secondary Staff – 75 special education teachers Collaboration – General and Special Education Staff – 2—elementary staff Behavior Management – General and Special Education Teachers – 30 participants Crisis Prevention Training – General and Special Education Staff – Alternative School – 12, Boonsboro Middle –12, Clear Spring Elem. – 3, Conococheague Elem. – 10 E. R. Hicks Middle – 6. School – Based Planning – Sharpsburg Elem., Maugansville Elem., Old Forge Elem., Pleasant Valley Elem., etc – 27 participants ADHD – Parent, General and Special Education Teachers – 300 participants Nurturing the Brain – Preschool Staff, Instructional Assistants – 75 participants Computerized IEP – Special Education Teachers and Related Staff – 75 participants Inclusion – All Secondary Special Education Staff – 75 participants Secondary General Education Staff – 400 participants Phonological Awareness – Speech Pathologists – 15 participants

^{*} A? Awareness Level; S? Skill Development Level; T? Transfer Level

Wicomico County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
MSPAP/IMAP	A/S/T	30	140	0	20
Behavior/Suspension	A/S/T	200	140	10	20
Autism	S/T	0	15	20	0
Language/Reading	A/S/T	30	50	20	0
ESOL	A/S/T	30	100	20	10
Inclusions	A/S/T	200	140	20	20

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: From notes: *See attached*, but attachment not available

^{*} A ? Awareness Level; S ? Skill Development Level; T ? Transfer Level

Worcester County Public Schools

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Inclusion and LRE	S/T	100	50	10	0
Disproportionality	A/S	50	50	10	0
Functional Behavior Asses	S/T	25	30	5	0
Program Results	Т	100	50	10	0

- 1. Countywide in-service held in August for all special ed. Staff on reading instruction, transitioning, functional behavior assessment and IMAP.
- 2. Summer workshops were offered for general and special education on assistive technology, inclusion, school improvement, program result, and disproportionality.
- 3. School wide in-service for Pocomoke Middle faculty on inclusion and behavior coaching and for Snow Hill Middle School on inclusion.
- 4. County wide in-service held in April for all special ed. Staff on inclusion.
- 5. TEACCH training for special ed. Teachers and parents in May.

Maryland School for the Deaf

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas

Level*
(A,S,T)

General Special Related Services Personnel

Personnel

Personnel

Related Services Personnel

No staff trained using Part B federal money.

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Original FT 2000 grant listed number of trainings anticipated, but amendment transferred that money to pay parents to staff Partners for Success office instead..

^{*} A ? Awareness Level; S ? Skill Development Level; T ? Transfer Level

The Maryland School for the Blind School Year 2001 - 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Special General Related "Other" Level* Training Areas Education Education Services (A,S,T)Personnel Personnel Personnel Personnel No submission from The Maryland School for the Blind available Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

^{*} A? Awareness Level; S? Skill Development Level; T? Transfer Level

Correctional Education

School Year 2001 – 2002 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
WJR Training	A/S	0	19	2	21
Computer Training	A/S	0	19	2	21

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

Statewide Woodcock-Johns Psycho-Educational Revised Test training.

^{*} A? Awareness Level; S? Skill Development Level; T? Transfer Level

Appendix D

School Improvement Grant Funding Sources by:

Goals
Institution of Higher Education

Local School System

FUNDING SOURCES BY GOAL, BY IHE, AND BY LSS

GOAL 1 IMPROVED PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MEASURES OF ACCOUNTABILITY: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation and technical assistance for school reform and system improvement.

IHE/LSS Grants (\$50,000-\$75,000)	LSS Grants (\$12,500)
Hood College – Develop in-service training on the Learning Strategies Intervention Model in Frederick and Washington Counties	Anne Arundel - MSPAP Instructional Strategies Frederick - MSPAP Instructional Strategies Worcester - MSPAP Analysis
Frostburg State University - Develop in-service training on the Learning Strategies Intervention Model in Garrett and Allegany Counties	
University of Maryland - Eastern Shore - Working cooperatively with four counties to analyze MSPAP scores	

GOAL 2 PREPARE SERVICE PROVIDERS TO WORK WITH INCREASED EFFECTIVENESS: Professional development will be designed and delivered on the basis of student performance data that demonstrate needs for building competencies and capacities to improve educational outcomes of students with disabilities.

IHE/LSS Grants (\$50,000-\$75,000)	LSS Grants (\$12,500)
Hood College - Develop in-service training on the Learning	Allegany - General Education Accommodations
Strategies Intervention Model in Frederick and Washington	Baltimore City - LRE In-services
Counties	Calvert - Reviewing I EPs for Access to General Education Curriculum
Frostburg State University - Develop in-service training on	Caroline - Reading Interventions
the Learning Strategies Intervention Model in Garrett and	Carroll - Reading Instruction
Allegany Counties	Cecil - FBA and BIP
Univ. of MD - Eastern Shore - Increase the retention of	Charles - Inclusion
SE teachers through a mentoring program	Dorchester - Accommodations in general education
	Garrett- Inclusion of SED Students
College of Notre Dame - I mprove teacher training in	Harford- Reading Interventions
reading (advanced coursework designed for students with	Howard - Mentoring new teachers
disabilities)	Kent- Differentiated Instruction Strategies
University of MD - College Park - Develop 5 new	Montgomery - Inclusion
professional development schools with PG County Public	Prince George's - Accommodations for Secondary Students
Schools	Queen Anne's - Academy of Reading
Western MD College - General Education Interventions	St. Mary's and Washington- Paraprofessional training
	Wicomico - Inclusion Model Training
	Maryland School for the Blind - Reading Comprehension Strategies

GOAL 3 PRESERVICE TRAINING WILL PREPARE PERSONNEL TO WORK WITH INCREASED EFFECTIVENESS: Pre-service programs will increase their productivity and capacities to align personnel preparation with standards-based reform and with professional development to improve education and the outcomes of students with disabilities.

IHE/LSS Grants (\$50,000-\$75,000)	LSS Grants (\$12,500)
Goucher College - Pre-service training in the area of educational diagnostics in order to ensure implementation of IEP	Howard - new teacher mentoring
Bowie State - Mentoring Program in PG county	
Coppin State - Developing an assessment institute, mentoring in Baltimore City	
Johns Hopkins University - Mentoring preschool special education teachers and providing related coursework	
Towson University – Design a blended Elem/SE teacher education program and develop PDSs, Mentoring new teachers in Howard County	
College of Notre Dame - Redesign SE teacher education program	
Mount St. Mary's College- Redesign SE teacher education program	

GOAL 4 EARLY INTERVENTION SYSTEMS WILL PREPARE CHILDREN WITH THE NECESSARY READINESS SKILLS FOR SCHOOL SUCCESS: The statewide early intervention system will improve its capacities to provide high-quality services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, and to promote readiness to learn.

IHE/LSS Grants	LSS Grants
(\$50,000-\$75,000)	(\$12,500)
Johns Hopkins University- Mentoring preschool special	
education teachers and providing related coursework	
Loyola College - Redesign ECI/SE teacher education	
program	

GOAL 5 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WILL ENSURE IMPROVED EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES: Capacities for improving instruction and outcomes of students with disabilities will be strengthened throughout Maryland's education community as a result of technical assistance for improvement of education and management of change.

IHE/LSS Grants	LSS Grants
(\$50,000-\$75,000)	(\$12,500)
Hood College - Develop in-service training on the Learning Strategies I ntervention Model in Frederick and Washington Counties Frostburg State University - Develop in-service training on the Learning Strategies I ntervention Model in Garrett and Allegany Counties Univ. of MD - Eastern Shore - Increase the retention of SE teachers through a mentoring program University of MD - College Park - Develop 5 new professional development schools with PG County Public Schools	Calvert - Reviewing I EPs for Access to General Education Curriculum Caroline - Reading Interventions Carroll - Reading Assessments Cecil - FBA and BIP Charles - Inclusion Dorchester - Accommodations in general education Garrett- Inclusion Harford- Reading Interventions Montgomery - Inclusion Prince George's - Accommodations for Secondary Students Queen Anne's - Academy of Reading St. Mary's - Paraprofessional training Washington - Paraprofessional training